dup!

STARR KING SCHOOL
FOR THE MINISTRY
2441 LE CONTE AVENUE
BERKELEY, CALIF. 94709

UNIVERSALIST
HISTORICAL LIBRARY

Crane Theological School
TUFTS UNIVERSITY
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

STARR KING SCHOOL
FOR THE MINISTRY
2441 LE CONTE AVENUE
BERKELEY, CALIF. 94709

THE

GOSPEL HERALD,

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. I.

FROM APRIL 1820, TO APRIL 1821, INCLUSIVE.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED FOR THE EDITOR.

.....

1821.

Copy 3

INDEX TO VOLUME I.

A

ANGELS, once men, unscriptural - - *page* 16
Atheism, not inconsistent with modern Orthodoxy, by Mentor - - - - - - - - 117
Antichrist, - - - - - - - - - 140
Address, delivered before "The Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," 178
Arminianism, Remarks on, - - - - - 180
Description of, by Calvinists - 187
Analogy, not so good as demonstration - 184
Anecdote, from Southey's Life of Wesley - *ibid.*
Atonement, Remarks on - - - - - 190
Acts xiii. 48 Remarks on, - - - - - 191
All, Rule for understanding this word, &c. - 196
A clergyman's opinion of the word, - 204

B

Boasting, when permitted, - - - - - 120
Birth, New, and Regeneration, two things, by Witness, - - - - - - - - 121
Bibles, new ones, - - - - - - - 183

C

CHRIST, the only God, - - - - - 7
Divinity of, proved by the testimony of the prophets, - 11, 14, 18, 31, 42
the sinner's Advocate - - - - 40
Genealogy of, Questions by Pothos, 83
Lineage of, explained, - - 91, 137
Divinity of, objected to by E. Sharman, - - - - - - - 89, 154
Divinity of, proved, in answer to ditto 89, 155
Cherubims, living creatures, - - 7, 27, 41, 42
Christian Character, traits of, - - - - 8
Cain's Wife, where from, - - - - - 27
Calvinism and *Hopkinsianism*, blessings arising to those who believe it, - - - - - 7, 39
where from, - - - - - - 140
Insectile, - - - - - - 68
Consequences of, - - - - - 83
Fletcher's strictures on, - - - - 184
Calvinists and *Methodists* at issue - - - 44
Questions to, - - - - - - 55
Confession, remarkable, of a Presbyterian clergyman, related by Theodore, - - - - 54
Calvin, (John) Extract of a letter written by him, 96
Apology for - - - - - - 114
His disciples' opinion of God's Will, - 184
Consistency, - - - - - - - - 106
Clarke, (Dr. Adam) absurdity of his doctrine - 148
Church of Rome, persecutions by, - - 176
Considerations, important ones, - - - - 177

D

Damnation and *Damned*, questions of - - 8
modern opinion of, considered by a Rationalist, 95
Death, change after, - - - - - - 16
eternal, remarks on, - - - - - 138
bed of, - - - - - - - 191
Daniel iii. 4, 5, 6. remarks on; contrast between ancient and modern idolaters, - - - 20
Doctrine, a specimen of that which is sound, - 55
old and good - - - - - - 84
Deism, objected to Christianity, by A Sincere Inquirer after Truth, - - - - - - 66
Refuted, in answer to ditto, - 66, 69 73
Apology for, in answer to ditto, by Theophilus, - - - - - - - - 75
Remarks on the above, - - - - *ibid.*
Deists, one pretending he was a Universalist 148
Doddridge, (Dr.) his opinion of what constitutes
Dean, Friend William, his Epistle, &c. - 160
the 'Incredible,' - - - - - - - 83
Dudith, his reproof to Beza, - - - - 176
Dialogues between Calvinists and Universalists, 212

E

Ecclesiastes xi. 3. Perversion of, remarks on the 16
Election, Scripture account of, 29—31, 33, 49, 65, 97
and Reprobation, remarks on, by the Rev. John Wesley, - - - - - 172
Eternal misery, the necessity of, considered, and admired, by the Rev. N. Strong - 56
Evans's (Rev. Mr.) Sketch, &c. remarks on, by J. B. 71
Everlasting, length of, - - - - - 40
definition of, - - - - - 105
Endless Misery, Letter to believers in - - 183
ERRATA, *See* pp. 72, 120, 124, 128, 164, 188

F

Faith, multiplicity of, by An Impartialist, - 39
Faith, Unity of, by An Impartialist, - - 81
Remarks on, - - - - - - - 81
Test of, - - - - - - - - 59
(Saving) considered, and its consequences 102
Free-agency, proofs of, by Reprehensor, 157, 206, 210
Objections to, in answer, 157, 207
Advocated by Timotheus, 203, 205, 209
Answered - - - *ib.* *ib.* *ib.*
Fragment, The Catholic and Quaker - - 200

G

GOD, on the Being of - - - - - 1—3
On the Attributes of, - - - - - 4
As demonstrated from reason, - - 5
As revealed in, and demonstrated from nature, - - - - - - - 6
As revealed in the Scriptures, &c. - - 7
Concluded, - - - - - - - 9
On the purposes of, as demonstrable from reason, and revealed in nature, and the Scriptures, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, 49, 65, 97
They who trust in him - - - 208
Attributes, remarks on, by Inquirer, 28, 32
Methodist's opinion of defeating Him 167
Answer to Methodist - - - 167 169
Gauntlet, Spiritual, thrown to the world, - 79
Griffin, (Dr.) Sermon of, extract from, - - 104
Gideon, opinions of, - - - - - - 194
Answered, - - - - - - 211

H

Hopkinsianism, refined, - - - - - - 8
Hell, redemption from, proved by Scripture, - 12
Hyperbole, remarkable instance of, - - - 32
Hebrews x. 9, 10. Remarks on, - - - - 96
Housa, city of, all Universalists - - - 136
Humanity, his request to the reader, - - 176
Heaven, taken by storm, - - - - - 183
Hopkinsians, their ordeal, - - - - - 191

I

Infidelity, considered by An Impartialist, 94, 114, 132, 133, 143
Remarks on Impartialist's view of it, 133, 144, 148
Interpolation, in Mark xiii. 32. - - - - 96
Infants, their future state considered - - 175
Intolerance, instance of, - - - - - 200

J

John v. 39. Remarks on, - - - - - 12
John viii. 21. Remarks on,—No man can go to Christ, - - - - - - - - 20
John iv. 14. Remarks on, God the Saviour of all men, 84
Judas, Christ's saying of him in Matt. xxvi. 24. explanation of requested by Cecilia, - - - 92
Remarks on, - - - - - 92, 93
do. by S*****, - - - - 140
Judgment, See 3d col. - - - - - - 12
Future, orthodox view of it, - - 147
Day of, - - - - - - - 208
Jeremiah xxxi. 15. Thoughts on, - - - - 196

L

Law, Moral, its requirements—promises nothing but temporal blessings, &c. - - - - 17, 18
Lightfoot, (Dr.) his devil, - - - - - 117
Love, Scripture account of, - - - - 120
and *Gratitude*, effects of, - - - 202
Latimer, Extract from a Sermon by, - - 192

M

Morality, the effect of a belief in the salvation of all men, by Halcyon - - - - - - 43
Mitchell, (Rev. E.) Sermon of, on Christian Universalism, - - - - - - - 45, 50
Men, corrupt trees, - - - - - - - 52
M'Clelland's Sermon, remarks on, by a Friend to Truth, 55
Moderation, propriety of by Amicus, - - 56
Matthew v. 11. Remarks on, - - - - 68, 160
i. 21, 22, 23. Remarks on, - - - 96
Moloch, Apology for, by Mikros, - - - 79
Remarks on, - - - - 80, 81. 136
Offering to, - - - - - - - 164
Advocate for - - - - - - 140
Mikros, Answer to, by Halcyon, - - - - 85
Ministers, Advice to, - - - - - - 136
Methodism, - - - - - - - - 140
Methodists, Inconsistency of their doctrine, - 148
Missionaries, Remarks on, - - - - - *ibid.*
Modern, by J. Taylor, 192, 191, 200, 202
Marvellous story by Missionaries, - - - - 168
Modern Theology, Specimen of, - - - - 173
Moses, Song of, - - - - - - - - 192
Moravians, notions peculiar to, - - - - *ibid.*
Misrepresentations, Complaints of, - - - - 208

N

Night, Watchman, What of the? - - - - 196
Newton, (Bishop) his Comments, - - - 197

O

Oppression, Ecclesiastical, - - - - - 53
Orthodoxy in miniature, - - - - - - 56
Pretenders to, - - - - - 156
Objection answered, - - - - - - 96
Ourang Outang, Dr. Clarke's serpent, by Pothos, 117

P

Psalm ix. 17. Remarks on, - - - - - 12
xi. 6. Remarks on, - - - - - 175
Pulpit Lies, - - - - - - - - 32
Bargains, absurdity of, - - - - 123
Punctuation, Opinion on, by Veritatis Amicus, 51, 64
Remarks on, - - - - - *ibid.*
Philotheus, Answer to, by A Rellyan, - - - 83
Advice to, by Savin, - - - - 212
Parable of the Sheep and Goats, - - 141, 150
Unjust Steward, - - 101, 105, 109
Rich Man and Lazarus, 113, 153, 193, 201
Proverbs i. 27. Remarks on, - - - - - 136
Preaching, Welch, Specimen of, - - - - 137
Remarks on, by Mentor, - 101
Pagans, Wonderful tractability of, - - 154
Pulpit, Freedom of the - - - - - 166
Pilgrim's Progress, a Substitute for the Bible - 176
Premium offered to Calvinists and Arminians 196
Punctilio, its operation, - - - - - 148
Objected to, by Savin, - - - - 182
Pharisaism, in miniature, - - - - - 191
Pharisees, Remarks on, - - - - 202

Q

Questions, Important, - - - - 19, 20, 40
Queries, by Philotheus, - - - - - 60
Important, - - - - - - 116
On Heb. iii., &c. - - - - - 160
Quakerism, by W. Dean, - - - - - 161
Remarks on - - - - - 162
By Philotheus, - - - - - 198
Remarks on, - - - 199, 204

R

Review of a Pamphlet on Predestination and Reprobation, - - - - - - - - - 22
Of Rev. A. M'Clelland's Sermon, 51, 63, 84
Of the Evangelical Guardian and Review, 103-106
Of D. Isaac's attempt at refutation - 103
Religion, Vital and Experimental, considered, - 40
Unknown to Unbelievers. Exposition of their doubts and fears, by Halcyon, - 62
Religious Intelligence, - - - - - 62, 123
Regeneration, distinct from New Birth, by Witness, 121
And the New Birth, remarks on - 130
Romans viii. 19, 20, 21. Translation of, remarks on, 134
Revelation xxii. 11. Exposition of - - 147, 149
xxi. 7, 8. Remarks on, - - - - 165
xiv. 11. Remarks on, - - - - 177
Retribution, Instance of, - - - - - - 176
Retrospect, - - - - - - - - - 212

S

Salvation, Unconditional - - - - - 7
Universal, proved from Scripture - 12
Questions on, by Philotheus, - - 34
Answers to, - - - 35, 37 39, 41
Conditions in, by Timotheus, - - 46
Proved unconditional, in answer, - *ibid.*
Of all men, proved by the oath of God 48
Unconditional, in answer to Philotheus, 60
Conditions in, by Miletum, - - 68, 79
Conditions in, refuted, in answer, *ibid.*
Conditional, by Mary, - - - - 72
Conditions in, refuted, in answer, - 72, 74
Conditional, by Philotheus, - 76, 85, 100
Conditions in, refuted, in answer, 76, 87, 89-100
Conditional, by Dean, 78, 95, 107, 128, 129
Conditions in, refuted, in answer, 78, 95, 107-128, 129
Considered, by Laura, - - - - 91
Conditional, by Theophilus, 108, 119, 123, 125

INDEX.

Salvation, Conditions in, refuted, in answer, 110, 120--123, 125
Conditional, by C. of N. J. - - - 135
Conditions in, refuted, in answer, 136
Conditional, by Vinedresser - - 138
Conditions in, refuted, in answer, 139, 141
Conditional, by J. C. - - 145. 170
Conditions in, refuted, in answer, 145, 171--173
Nature of, by J. C. - - 181, 185, 195
Remarks on, in answer to J. C. *ibid.* 199
Singing, Propriety of, - - - - - - 52
Scriptures, Harmony of the, - - - - - 64
Difficulty in searching the, - - 86
Illustrations of the, - - - 119
Interpolation in the, - - - 110
Perversion of the, - - - - *ibid.*
Salvable state, remarks on, - - - - - 96
Servetus, (Michael) account of the murder of, and John Calvin's part in the transaction, 114, 177
Soul, Its pre-existence objected to, by Timotheus, 117
Considered, in answer to Timotheus, - *ibid.*
Scott, (Rev. T.) His Commentary, remarks on, by Mentor, - - - - - - - - - 123
Satan, Intention of, by a pretender to Universalism 150
Schoolboy, Exercises of a, - - - - 158, 159
Substance, Shadow mistaken for the, - - 160
Subscribers, Distant, notice to, - - - 204
Notice to, - - - - - - 208

T

Trinity, Absurdity of the modern doctrine of, considered, - - - - - - - - - 9, 10
Remarks on, by Theodore, - - 54
Truth, Singular evasion of the, - - - 96
Harmony of the, - - - - 196
And Error, or Mr. Wesley and Dr. Clarke, 160
Titus ii. 11. Remarks on the erroneous translation of, - - - - - - - - 134, 135
Thinking, What do you think? - - 152, 208
Times, Signs of the - - - - - - 191

U

Unpardonable Sin, doctrine of examined, and refuted, *at the request of Cecilia*, - - 57, 61
Universal Salvation, objections to, answered, by Relly, - - - - - - - - 82
Brief view of, in a Letter, addressed to a Lady, by A. B. - - - 98, 99
Universalism, at tempt to prove it false, by Amator Veritatis, - - - - - - - 111
Proved to be truth, in answer to Amator Veritatis, - - - - 111, 115, 118
On a broad scale, by Mysticus 122
Objection to, answered, by Alexis 136
Licentious, - - - - - *ibid.*
Confounds and destroys itself, 156
Unitarians. Appeal of the, - - - - 188
Remarks on, - - 188, 189
Advocate for, - - - 190
Universalist, Puzzling Question to an, - 196

V

Vinedresser, His opinion of clergymen, &c. 138

W

World, according to orthodox Commentators, ended 1800 years ago, - - - 49
Writing, Fashionable, Consequence of, - 148
Wisdom, better than rubies, - - - 208

Y

Yield, Extensive meaning of the word, - 197

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

Behold! from Calvary's top afar,
The banner of the God of war;
Peace is proclaim'd to Adam's sons,
And Death and Hell receive their doom.

Christ is our Captain, and the war
With Antichrist we now declare;
Arm'd with eternal truth we come,
To send the vanquish'd demon home.

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1820. NO. 1.

*** *We republish this Prospectus in our first number, as the fundamental law and constitution of this paper.*

The title affixed to this Prospectus, is a brief exhibition of its contemplated contents. "Jesus Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever," is our only Counsellor, Pattern, and Guide. Antichrist, in all the Protean forms he may assume, our only enemy. And confident of success, under the auspices of our Almighty Commander, "we fight, not as those who beat the air," but like those who are certain of victory. What is the feeble glimmer, and delusive twinkling of error, compared with the refulgent glory of the sunshine of truth? What are the impotent efforts of an already vanquished demon, compared with the inconceivable power of that God, who speaks worlds into being, and at whose frown creation trembles to its centre? To vindicate "the ways of God to man"—to pour the wine and oil of the joy of the salvation of our God into the wounded hearts of our brethren of Adam's race, who are groping in the darkness of error and unbelief; and to break the bands of antichristian slavery, and sunder every yoke, are the incentives to action. To the candid inquirer after truth, our patience shall be exercised, and keep pace with his importunity. To the honest disputant, we will oppose patient investigation. To the wavering, the unanswerable declarations and oath of God. To the infuriated bigotry of antichristian zealots, the two edged sword of the gospel of Christ! And to all men, charity—To their *errors! Truth!* The columns of this Paper will be open to all religious sects, confined to none. Truth is the object; reason, the means to obtain it; and the scriptures, the source from which alone it is to be obtained.

It is to be understood, that the Editor possesses a right, in common, to combat error, and investigate truth. And that the character this paper may assume, depends upon the public, or those, whose communications shall demonstrate the Truth; and not to the arbitrary will of any man living. "For wisdom is better than rubies; and all the things that may be desired, are not to be compared to it." Therefore, to obtain this inestimable treasure, "search the scriptures," for "they testify of me," is the declaration of Christ. Truth investigated and scrutinized, in the closest possible manner, will always appear like gold tried seven times and purified. And error, like dross, be completely separated, identified, and destroyed. No communication will ever be rejected by the Editor of this paper, provided it is couched in admissible terms, and even under exceptionable circumstances, (personalities excepted,) if the writer insists upon the publication of his sentiments, he shall be gratified, on condition of publicly acknowledging them for his own.

The candle shall not be placed under a bushel, but in the house.

The glory of God, and the happiness of man, is a subject, involving consequences of such momentous importance, that mankind universally should give it the preference to all others. And were it understood, it would unquestionably receive attention, at least, in some measure commensurate with its value.

Regarding all men as our brethren, and looking forward with faith to the accomplishment of the promises, when "the knowledge of God shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea;" the asperities of our corrupt nature are softened, and man becomes the friend of man.

In the confident assurance that the promulgation of the blessed truths, which are contained in the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, will have a tendency to effect so desirable an end, the public are requested to patronise this "Herald of good news," and give it support, so long, and no longer, than it shall contend for God's glory, and the happiness of the family of Man.

CONDITIONS.

This Work will be of the royal quarto form; each number consisting of four pages, on good paper, at $3 per year; six months to be paid in advance, on the delivery of the first number. and no subscription received for less than six months, at the expiration of which, all who please to continue their support, will advance the remainder of the subscription. It will be published weekly, on Saturdays, as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers can be obtained to justify the undertaking; and will be devoted exclusively to Theological discussion and inquiry, without regard to name, sect, or party. This paper will be printed with a long primer type, and make a royal quarto volume of 212 pages annually, including an Index of the contents, which will be delivered to each subscriber at the close of the year, to complete the volume.

ON THE BEING OF GOD.

"*For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.*" PAUL.

It is universally admitted, that to obtain a knowledge of any art or science, an acquaintance with the principles on which that art or science is founded, is absolutely necessary; and that our knowledge of that art or science, will be in an exact proportion to our knowledge of the principles on which it is founded. What could be more absurd than to give a man a complicated sum in arithmetic, which would require the application of every rule and table belonging to that science, to investigate and complete it, and he ignorant that eight times ten amounted to eighty, and could not be more or less; and that twenty substracted from eighty, left sixty; and that addition increased, and substraction reduced; and that numbers were figures, in themselves a nonentity, but were an infallible rule to calculate a substance? Where is the man who would intrust his property to the management of one, who was so grossly ignorant of the manner of ascertaining its numerical importance, or of disposing of it, when he did not know the method of calculating its value? There is not a man living, in the quiet possession of his mental faculties, who would be guilty of so great improvidence. How often are we told that the concerns of this life bear no proportion to the concerns of a never ending existence beyond the grave, to another world, to *eternity*. And admitting the truth of these premises, which no reasonable man can deny, how preposterous is the conduct of those, whose actions are an almost continual reversion and denial of their principles. Lives there a man, who would neglect the appropriation of five dollars to any specific purpose, were he firmly convinced that by so doing he would receive five thousand? No!—Is there a man who would neglect the appropriation of five dollars, were he firmly convinced it would prevent his los-

ing five thousand? No! And yet we are told, that if we keep the law of God, we save our souls; and if we violate his law, we lose our souls. And strange to tell, there are many men who profess with their mouths this belief, who take much greater precaution, and use more means to preserve their money than their souls. Is such conduct consistent with such principles? and are "these trees known by their fruits?" Who can witness such conduct without recurring to the declaration of the prophet? "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." If the concerns of this world are comparatively of no consequence, when put in competition with those of a future world, and if all men are accountable to God, as their Creator and Judge, how obvious must it be to every man, that without the knowledge of the being, character, and purposes of his Creator and Judge, that he has no foundation for his hopes, or measure for his fears.—Is God my enemy? where shall I find a covert to screen me from the bolt of his vengeance, hurled by the "red arm" of incensed Omnipotence? Is he my friend? who can marshal a host against him, or drag me from the shelter of his pavilion? Who can destroy the high tower of my defence; or transfix my bosom with a dart, when it is covered with the shield of God? Did a man stand convicted of crimes, and amenable to an earthly tribunal, would not his anxiety be increased in proportion as he was ignorant of the characters of those who were to decide his fate? and would not his anxiety diminish, and his hopes revive in proportion as he became acquainted with the reputation of his judges, and believed that their characters were good, their mercy great, their compassion abundant; and that even pity smiled, where justice held the balance?—He would. And as eternity exceeds the fleeting moments of time, so much more are we interested in the character of our Eternal Judge. It is a happy circumstance for man, that this knowledge is as simple as it is important; and that the means of acquiring it is as extensive, as its necessity is obvious. The book of nature is the book of God.

"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their word to the end of the world." Although an Atheist, if there is such a "Lusus Naturæ," may not peruse this paper, still it may be proper to demonstrate the being of God; it may add fresh evidence to the wavering, and cannot offend the Christian. There are many things received as truths, which will admit of proof, but cannot be demonstrated. We may prove by the concurring testimony of historians, that the City of Carthage once existed, and contained a numerous population; but we cannot prove it to a demonstration, for we know of no absolute necessity, why that city should have existed; yet no man denies this fact, but believes that this city did exist. It must be evident to every person, that a truth is simple or compound, in proportion as it needs facts to investigate, or evidence to prove it; and that it is easy or difficult to be understood, and consequently to be believed, in proportion as it is simple or compound; and that we yield our assent to facts in proportion as we understand them; and that it is impossible to believe, or disbelieve a thing or principle from mere courtesy; but that we are obliged from a necessity of our natures, which is without our control, to believe when our understanding is convinced of the truth of the thing to be believed. A compound truth necessarily creates doubts; we see no necessity for believing; on the contrary, a simple truth forces conviction, for it is at first sight more difficult to disbelieve than to believe it; and where the mind is not partially deranged by prejudice and error, arguments are as unnecessary to force conviction, as entreaties would be to a hungry man, to partake of a feast. Man is a reasonable creature; or rather, a creature capable of reasoning; and the great difference of opinion and principles, which exists among mankind, does not proceed from diversity of nature, but from education. If it is objected that children of the same family frequently differ, I answer, a child may have a hundred teachers out of doors, and that his education is often the effect of accident, if not the sport of circumstances. Man is so constituted, that he will, nay, he must act. He never was—he never can be neutral. Happiness is his "end and aim." And the reason he does not obtain it is, because he is so blinded by passion, or prejudice, or both, that he pursues misery by mistake, and as certainly, as cause precedes consequence. I appeal to the experience of every person, for the truth of these premises.

Man has been called a "religious animal." The history of the world, and the almost innumerable sects who have distracted it with their disputes and contentions, prove it incontestably. If we examine the characters and attributes of the many wooden, or imaginary deities, at whose shrines, men in every country, and in every age have bowed the knee, or immolated the victim, we shall have examined the characters of the worshippers, and their religions likewise. We find the polished and polite Athenians, erecting a superb altar, and inscribing it "to the unknown God."—And that sophistry and credulity stamped the manners, and appeared the religion of the age. We behold imperial Rome deifying the creature, building magnificent temples, and by assuming the attributes of their idols, they plunge in every species of dissipation, riot, and debauch, until the worshippers and their gods are included in one common undistinguished ruin. If we look at Carthage, the rival of Rome, we see a nation less enlightened; fear characterizes the worshipper, their children are their offerings, and their own blood deluges the temples of devils.—Even the Jews, the peculiar people of God, forsook his worship; bowed the knee to the idols of the surrounding nations, and burned their children in the fire, an offering to Moloch.—Is the god malicious? the worshippers are cruel. Fear, with its concomitant guilt, points to the victim, and the deluded worshipper sacrifices his child, to save himself.—At such a picture, every rational principle revolts. And the mind of the benevolent would shrink to nothing, rather than prostitute every social principle of our nature to the purposes of cruelty, murder, and revenge; notwithstanding they may be dignified with the names of religion, piety, and devotion to the gods.—In addition to the multiplied evils, which result from ignorance of the true character of God, there is another powerful incentive to urge us to acquaint ourselves with his character, for we are told, "That it is life eternal to know God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent." We are likewise told, that "we must believe that he is." "I Am," is not only an appellation to indentify, but is declaratory of being. And the existence of God, from being the most simple of all truths, from its necessity, is likewise the most compound, from the infinity of evidence which may be adduced in proof of the fact. It is the only truth which abounds with compound testimony, unnecessary to prove the fact. "A straw," has extorted from a professing Atheist, a confession of the existence of God the Creator of all things, when human arguments have proved unavailing. The Atheist, who declares that chance produced all things, indirectly admits, what he directly denies; for if chance produces, chance is a cause. "And as nothing or the negation of all properties and realities cannot be a cause, since nothing can have nothing, and produce nothing." Therefore, "reality in some degree or other is the only reason of inferring necessary existence, since nothing cannot be a cause."*

Proposition 1st.

"There must have been from all eternity some original self-existent Being.

Demonstration.

Nothing, or the negation of all properties and realities, cannot be a cause. Reality in some degree or other is the only reason of necessary existence. Therefore, there must have been from all eternity some original, necessary, self-existent Being.

Scholium or Illustration.

Since something now is, it is manifest that something always was, otherwise the things that now are must have been produced by nothing, that is, not produced at all, since nothing cannot be a cause. Now, this eternal *something*, must be self-existent,

* Ramsay's Phil. Prin. of Nat. and Rev. Rel. Vol. I.

that is, it must contain in itself a reason why it does exist rather than not exist, a foundation upon which its existence relies; some internal cause of existence, that renders its non-existence impossible, and its existence necessary.

Proposition 2d.

The greater reality a being has, the greater is the reason for its necessary existence.

Demonstration.

A self-existent substance is that which contains in itself a ground, or reason, which makes its existence necessary, and its non-existence impossible. Reality in some degree or other is the only reason of necessary existence. Therefore, the greater reality a being has, the greater is the reason for its necessary existence.

Scholium.

In the scale of finites, we may conceive innumerable beings, superior to any one determinate finite, since progression here may be infinite. At whatsoever degree of being we stop, we may still conceive innumerable other beings that have more reality and perfection than this determinate one, and consequently that have a greater reason for existing necessarily than it. Necessary existence therefore cannot belong to any one of them, unless it belongs to all of them equally, and then we must say that the idea of simple existence, and that of necessary existence, are the same. Now this is absolutely false; for modes or forms may have real existence, and yet may be changed, destroyed, and reproduced. It may be answered, that there is a great difference between *substantial and modal* realities. We grant it, but both are equally realities, though they are not *equal* realities. Now, since the force of this reasoning depends upon their being realities, this evidence is incontestable.

Corollary, or Consequence.

First.—No finite of an inferior degree contains in itself a reason of necessary existence, preferable to a finite of superior degree.

2d. In the scale of finites we can stop at no being of any determinate degree, that has an adequate reason of necessary existence, proper to itself alone, and exclusive of all others.

3d. Hence the idea of *Absolute Infinite* contains an adequate reason of necessary existence proper to itself alone, and exclusive of all others, since beyond *Absolute Infinite* there is, and can be no progression.

Proposition 3d.

The eternal, necessary, self-existent being is absolutely infinite.

Demonstration.

A self-existent being is that which contain in itself a reason of necessary existence. Nothing besides *Absolute Infinite* contains in itself a reason of necessary existence. Therefore, the eternal, necessary, self existent being is absolutely infinite, or infinite in all perfections.

Scholium.

Thus we have discovered that the reason, the foundation, and the source of God's self-existence is his absolute infinity, or infinity in all perfections. The idea of no finite, includes that of necessary existence. Its non-existence is not impossible; we may suppose it annihilated without any contradiction; whereas it is manifestly repugnant to say, that a being that contains all perfections does not include the greatest and first of these perfections, which is that of necessary existence. For this reason the Legislator of the Jews defines God the Being that is, or the self-existent Being, to insinuate that finite is the being that was made, and that God alone is the being that is. Whatever is self-existent must be absolutely infinite, and whatever is absolutely infinite, must be self-existent. This is the simplest, shortest, and most natural way of demonstrating the existence of God. It is not deducing this great truth from the bare idea and definition of a God, whose existence is not yet demonstrated; but from the idea of a self-existent being, whom all must allow; even the most incredulous. We abandon the subtle modern reasonings both of the metaphysical and natural philosophers, and have recourse with Moses to the idea of the self-existent essence, as the only source of demonstration. We dare venture to say, that all those who endeavour to disparage the evidence of this ancient Mosaical demonstration, because of its wondrous simplicity, have no just notions of the original constitution of the human mind. Since the being of God is the first, and greatest of all truths, it was worthy of Almighty wisdom to make our faculties such that this demonstration should appear to them the most easy and obvious; strike them upon the least reflection, and convince them of the existence of a God from the bare inspection of the idea of a self-existent being whom all must allow. Lost and sunk in this immense ocean of *Absolute Infinite;* solitary with God alone, let us shut our eyes, stop our ears, impose silence upon sense and imagination, fix all our powers upon this one object, retire into our spiritual natures, and examine, by this great idea of the self-existent *Absolute Infinite*, what are his attributes and perfections.—Ere we begin this research, however, we must draw three very useful corollaries from this proposition.

First. All finite substances really existent, must be effects, productions, or creatures of absolute infinite; since nothing is self-existent but he alone.

Second. To whatever degree of reality or perfection we elevate any being, this cannot be absolute infinite, if we can conceive another being superior to it.

Third. How great soever be the perfections we attribute to the self-existent, eternal cause, they cannot belong to absolute infinite, if we can conceive perfections superior to them in any degree.

Proposition 4th.

Absolute infinite excludes all negation, privation, and defect.

Demonstration.

Absolute Infinite, is the most perfect negation of finite. Finite is only what contains some degrees of reality and perfection, and is a negation of infinitely superior reality and perfection; wherefore its contrary, or absolute infinite, is the negation of all finite, that is, of all negation, and so excludes all negation, privation, and defect.

Scholium.

Though the grammatical term *Infinite* seem negative, yet its true sense is affirmative when applied to God. The negation of all bounds is the fulness of all perfection. It is the actual possession of being and reality in the highest degree, without any shadow of privation, defect, or limitation; without any possibility of increase, decrease, or variation; and surely this object has nothing negative in it.—It finally follows as a necessary and inevitable consequence, that "all we can conceive of absolute infinite is, that it is greater than any idea we can form of it; that it surpasses all finite comprehension, and that it is none of those things that we can imagine. Thus, though the object of this idea be positive, yet the idea we form of it, is altogether negative, as Locke very well demonstrates. But it were false to conclude from thence, that the object of that idea includes any negation; as it would be absurd to say that because our idea of God is imperfect, therefore his essence is such." Believing in the being and existence of God, the Creator of all things; we of necessity acknowledge ourselves to be the creatures of his power and workmanship. That he had a design in our creation, no man in his senses will deny. But what that design was, is a question which immediately concerns every son and daughter of Adam to know. The simple belief of the existence of a God, without any knowledge of his attributes, or purposes, however it may be supposed to approximate to the creed of the Christian, will be productive of very little of his hopes, or his confidence. The book of nature has been open to man in every age, and God has never "left himself without a witness, having sent rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling the heart of man with food and gladness." These constant manifestations of love and goodness were disregarded, or ascribed to gods of wood, or stone, perchance a golden calf; and strange to relate, not unfrequently to devils. The occasion of the reproof of Daniel to Belteshazzar, is a striking instance of the blindness of man. "Thou hast praised the gods of silver, and gold, of brass, iron, wood and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know; and the God in whose hand thy

breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified."

Whether there has been a tradition handed down from the first man Adam, or whether the Creator has placed an intuitive principle in the mind of man, certain it is, that men in every age have at least had indistinct notions of a something which they have supposed to be superior to themselves, and to which they have rendered praise, and offered worship; and whose wrath they have attempted to deprecate by sacrifices and offerings.

The attributes of God can be demonstrated from reason. They are revealed in his works, and in his word.—The book of nature, and the book of revelation harmonizes. They are in unison. Let it not be supposed that by nature, crime and depravity is meant. "God is a God of order, and not confusion." Nature came from the plastic hands of her Creator, pure as the light of Heaven. At her birth, "the stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Nature is heaven's commentator. With her right hand raised to the heavens, she declareth the glory of God, while her left sweeps the concave firmament, and describes his handy work; and her planetary messengers carry the tidings through the vast expanse, to creation's utmost bounds. Have the stars lost their brilliancy? Have the planets wandered from their courses? Has the landscape faded to the view? Or has the purblind vision of Adam's wayward sons led them astray in the maze of error and unbelief, until they have lost sight of their beauties, forgotten their origin, and forsaken their God!

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD CAN BE DEMONSTRATED FROM REASON.

We believe a greater absurdity cannot be conceived, than the frequent declaration that God has a secret will, producing secret decrees, effecting the eternal welfare of his creatures; and that his attributes are partially revealed, and so much kept back and hid from man, that his future state is very uncertain. We feel it to be a duty to set this absurd and impious declaration in its proper light; and we trust that a simple exposure will be sufficient to entail upon it that abhorrence and detestation, which it so justly merits. "Trust in the Lord all ye people. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth. Praise the Lord, all ye nations; praise him all ye people, for his merciful kindness is great toward us, and the truth of the Lord endureth forever. As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth."

Now to say that God has a secret will, different in the smallest possible degree from his revealed will, is to accuse him of dissimulation and hypocrisy. What should we say of a man, who told his neighbours to trust in him; and when they applied to him for succour received for answer, that he had a secret will or purpose; and instead of assisting them, did them an essential injury; and instead of saving them from trouble, increased their difficulties? Suppose a man were to receive praise because he was merciful; and it was afterwards discovered that he had a secret will, or disposition which was not merciful; would the praise continue to be offered? and if so, what would he be praised for? Again, conceive of a man who should tell you that he had no pleasure in your sickness, provided you should be sick; and you were to find yourself the victim of pain and disease, and he should prolong your sickness and increase your pain, to what would you attribute it, to his love and affection for you? and would a disclosure on his part of a secret purpose of soul, which he had cherished to distress and afflict you, operate as a bane, or antidote? In fine, if the very righteousness of the creature is but "filthy rags," compared with the purity of the Creator, where can we find language sufficiently strong to express a just abhorrence of the preposterous impiety of those, who accuse a God of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, of purposes and intentions, which would even degrade a fallen man in the opinion of his fellow worm. What conception has that man of his Maker, who would attempt to degrade him by attributing to him purposes, which he himself would be ashamed to own, and even the implication of which, would kindle his resentment.

Is there a man living who will patiently hear his earthly friend traduced, who deserves the name of friend? And shall that "friend who sticketh closer than a brother," and who unsolicited, gave his life a ransom for us, find none to "defend his cause, or maintain the honour of his name?" "Is he so poor that none will do him reverence?" Shall that name which is more fragrant than the perfumes of Arabia, *Saviour*, be degraded to that of *destroyer and executioner?* and shall it be accounted orthodox treason to lift our voice against it? Heaven forbid.—The day is on the wing, when the Aurora of salvation which dawned on Calvary's mount, shall burst upon the world in the full meridian of gospel splendour; and the revivifying rays of the Sun of Righteousness illume the once darkened corners of this now benighted world.

However great may be the pleasure arising from the anticipation of this glorious event, that pleasure cannot be in possession of him, who either doubts the power, wisdom, or goodness of God to accomplish it. A knowledge of the attributes of God will lead us to a similar knowledge of his purposes. And this inquiry is a duty enjoined on us by the word of God, enforced by every principle of reason, and is indispensably necessary to our temporal enjoyment. If "the proper study of mankind is man," there is a far greater propriety in saying, the proper study of the Christian is his God. Progressing in this divine inquiry, let us gather from reason, nature and revelation, all the information in our power, and "ask wisdom" to direct us of him who giveth liberally, and upbraideth not." Reason, or the faculty we possess of perceiving and judging, is the gift of our Creator, and not our own acquirement. And if it is the only means in our possession, whereby we can obtain knowledge to direct, how manifest is the absurdity of those who attempt to disparage its usefulness, and decry its value. Much of this folly would be prevented, were a proper distinction made between the animal appetites of the body, and the faculties of the soul. The first, is the animal instinct and passion common to the beast of the field; the last, the seal and impress of a God. It is the barrier that divides man from the brute. It is the first link in the chain, that binds him to heaven. "Come and let us reason together," is the invitation of God. And was man incapable of reasoning, a being infinite in wisdom never would have condescended to have any communication with him. Come then and let us mortals reason together, that we may assist each other in our inquiries of him, who can make our "sins, though now the colour of scarlet, or crimson, as white as wool, or snow."

First, it must be admitted, that every property of an absolute infinite Being is perfect; for imperfection cannot be attributed to Almighty power, wisdom or goodness; and it follows as a consequence that all the attributes of God are the perfections of God.

Second. It must likewise be admitted, that all that a finite mind can conceive of God, is included in these three attributes; *Almighty power, infinite wisdom, and unbounded goodness.*

Third. These infinite attributes, powers and perfections of God are able to effect infinite purposes, far transcending the conception of a finite mind; and however they may be diversified, they can never be separated, or act counter to each other. For God never can be tempted, being the sole proprietor and owner of all things. Who can bribe Omnipotence? "Who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things."

Infinite Wisdom can devise means to remedy finite evils.

If there is an infinite evil in the universe, there must be an infinite being diverse from God, and adverse to him, for God's infinite wisdom would foresee, and his unbounded goodness would prompt his Almighty power to prevent an infinite evil. Therefore, there cannot be in the universe an infinite evil, without there is an infinite evil being to produce it. And if this were admitted, it would destroy the belief in God's infinity, for he could not be Almighty, if there was a power adverse to him which he could not destroy. And if evil is not infinite, it will be destroyed, root and branch; or a power will exist adverse to infinite goodness. And if God is almighty in wisdom, and evil is to be continued, and never be destroyed, it must have existed with God from eternity; or else God has changed, formed a new purpose, and altered his plan of government. It is impossible for human reason to get rid of these alternatives. They follow as an inevitable consequence. To suppose the first, would be to imbibe all the errors of the Pagan, who believes in two supreme beings, one good, and the other bad. And while he courts the favour of the one, he deprecates the anger of the other. And to suppose the last, would be to arrrive at the very achme of absurdity, contradiction and folly.

Infinite Goodness will devise means to remedy finite evils.

Good and evil, light and darkness, order and disorder, are the greatest extremes in the universe. It is an eternal law of nature that they shall be opposed to each other; they never can amalgamate, assimilate, or mix; between these, there never will be truce, or peace; one or the other must fall, and the victory will not be complete, while one enemy remains. "The wages of sin is death." Sin is the cause, evil the consequence. If the cause is removed, the effect must cease. There is not a man living who is in possesssion of only one half of his rational faculties, who will deny this palpable truth. The question now presents itself in a form, which requires a definite answer. Will infinite goodness continue sin as the cause, and thereby ensure misery or evil, as the consequence? Is it possible to answer this in the affirmative, without being guilty of blasphemy? And if answered in the negative, will it not be to the glory of God's unbounded goodness, by ascribing to it a power, which will overrule all things, overcome all evil, and set his infinity in its proper light? Much is said about the justice of God. His justice is represented as being at variance with his other attributes. What is justice? Is the unmerciful man just? If so, justice and cruelty, are convertible terms. Is it just to forgive our enemies; to be merciful? If so, then mercy and justice are convertible terms. Is the judge merciful, when he condemns the criminal to be executed? If he is not merciful, he is unjust.

To be continued.

N. B. The public have now an opportunity to judge of the Editor's sentiments; if they are right, receive them; if wrong, prove them so. The columns of this paper stand open to the world.

To Subscribers.

In the conditions annexed to the prospectus of this paper, it was stated, that this paper should be printed with a "small pica type." This was a mistake, it should have been "long primer," which is a smaller type, and which will be used in the future numbers. The price of this paper has been objected to. The Editor pledges himself either to enlarge its size, or reduce the price, when the subscription list shall justify *the measure.*

To Correspondents.

All Communications forwarded the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are requested to send their communications to the office of The Gospel Herald, No. 93 Gold Street.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD STREET.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1820. NO. 2.

ON THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD, AS DEMONSTRATED FROM REASON.

(*Concluded.*)

God is the only being in the universe who is just; because he is the only being in the universe who is good and merciful. It would be a gross absurdity to describe a being of any grade whatever, as being wise, and just and good, and at the same time deficient in mercy. Is it wise to be merciful? if so, it must be because it is just; and it cannot be just, except it be good. If we say a being is good, we imply every thing else. He must be almighty in power, to resist temptation. He must be infinite in mercy, or justice, or goodness, or he would use that power to the injury of his inferiors. He must be the Creator and owner of all things, or he would be under obligations to others, for the possession of that, which did not belong to him. In fine, he must be almighty in power, unerring in wisdom, and unbounded in goodness. Therefore, there is no power but is derived from him. And the wisdom and goodness, which exists in a measure in finite beings, is but an emanation from his fulness.

Almighty Power will remedy finite evils.

The first quere which occurs to the mind is, whether God is able; the second, whether he is willing; if he is both able and willing, will he not do it? Who shall hinder? If we were to turn to the scriptures to learn the will of God, we think the task would be easy, and the proofs conclusive. We shall do this at another opportunity. The evidences drawn from reason and nature, if not conclusive, may prepare the mind for the direct evidence of God himself.

The union of the three, reason, nature, and revelation, must be considered by every person, whose senses are not deranged by prejudice and error, as perfectly irresistible. The ideas which men form of justice, or goodness, are correct in proportion as they are borrowed from the divine economy; whether the book of nature or revelation is consulted; and only in proportion as they are governed by their reason, in either case. It must be evident, at first sight, that justice and reason are convertible terms, for that cannot be reasonable which is unjust; or just which is unreasonable. And as God gave us our reason as a guide, it would be absurd to suppose that he gave us for a criterion, the reverse of every thing which could promote our welfare. There cannot, in the nature of things, be two kinds of justice, or mercy, or goodness. It may differ in quantity, but two things that differ in quality, cannot be alike. It is impossible—this is a rule that can never fail. We may mistake the rule, we may err in its application, and our mistakes and errors will be found, upon a close examination, to proceed from our passions, our prejudices, or our ignorance, the consequence of both. Passion is the root, prejudice the branch, and ignorance the fruit.

The truth of these premises is proved by the common occurrences of life. The thousand disputes and contentions in the world, relative to the disposing of property; and the interested views of those concerned; their lax interpretation, as respects themselves, of the principles of justice; and their zeal in exacting it of others; speaks a language too plain to be misunderstood, even by those, who have learned only the first lesson in the school of reason, or read the first page in the volume of nature. "Do as you would be done by;" is the language of reason, of nature, and of justice or revelation. It is a criterion infallible in its nature; universal in its application; and eternal in its duration. There is implanted in the breast of every intelligent creature, a desire for happiness, and if every one desired the happiness of the other, every one would comply with the first and strongest demand of reason, of nature, and of nature's God. This is the very essence of justice. It is the offspring of heaven; the child of God; the heir to eternity. The reverse of this, is the very essence of injustice. It is the offspring of hell; the child of the devil; the heir to destruction. This principle is, in ethics, what an universal menstruum would be in chemistry. It will never fail to produce a solution. It will dissolve doubts, and make that certain, which, without its application, would be dark, obscure and doubtful. There is not one attribute, or property which the human mind can conceive of as belonging to God, which is not in perfect unison with this principle. And if any principle of action is attributed to Deity, incompatible with this eternal principle of reason, of nature and of justice, we are bound, by every principle of reason, nature and justice, to reject it with abhorrence. Reader, lay aside all passion, prejudice and unbelief; and calmly and deliberately consider, before you condemn. Remember that *you* are interested in the truth of the following result, which is founded on the union, connexion and agreement of every truth in reason, in nature, and in justice, or revelation. *Namely*, God the Creator will do to man, the created, that which he the Creator would be willing to have done to him, were he in the place of man, the created.* This is the foundation of every hope; it is the corner stone in the fabric of reason, of justice, and of common sense. Destroy this, and you introduce anarchy, confusion and despair.

These are the deductions of reason; of that reason which emanated from the eternal fountain and source of life, and light, and love. If there is any man who doubts, or disbelieves these eternal truths, to such a one I would say; If you deny this, you must either believe the reverse of this principle to be justice, or believe nothing. There is no possible middle ground, on which you can place a single argument, or lodge a single fact. If you believe the reverse of this principle, I leave you to meditate on the ghosts of every sentiment that can impart joy; and of every principle, which can inspire confidence.

The sovereignty of God is sometimes, and by those who at least must be said to have some doubts of his mercy, brought forward as an objection to his being merciful. It is exhibited as a sovereign power, holding wisdom and goodness like trembling captives. And it is more than insinuated, that because sovereign power can, sovereign power may do that, which, right or wrong, we have no other alternative but submission. These blasphemous doubts, insinuations and fears, have neither reason or revelation for their support. The attributes of Deity are all sovereign. And were the possibility of such an event reasonable, and his attributes separated, one from the other, mercy would be as likely to predominate as power, and wisdom as either. A person must be grossly ignorant of his Creator, whatever may be his other acquirements, who for one moment could suppose an *Absolute Infinite Being* a subject of caprice, and swayed by one power, to the detriment of the other infinite qualities of his mind.—And this appears in its proper, though inconceivably horrid and impious light, when we reflect, that poor impotent man is made the tenant of the hospital for lunatics, for the very reason which is assigned by our modern system makers, for the inconsistency of their doctrines, and the terrific fury of their gods.

The attributes of God are revealed in, and are demonstrable from nature.

"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work." If we consider the power of God as manifested in nature, where shall we find words sufficiently expressive to define that power? and if we trace the Creator in the infinity of his works, and aid our conception by comparison, what must be our astonishment to find that this immense globe we inhabit, compared with the whole, and that whole circumscribed within the limits of even our finite capacities, is but as a drop in the ocean, or a grain of sand compared to the earth. If we admire the wisdom and skill of man, in constructing complicated and useful machinery, with what profundity of wonder and awful astonishment shall we raise our eyes, and strain our conceptions to form even an imperfect idea of that inconceiva-

* If any man objects to the phraseology of this paragraph, he is requested to make his comments on the following.

Psalm xcvi. 13—He shall judge the world with righteousness. Matthew vii. chap. 11th and 12th verses. If ye then, being evil, know *how* to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him. Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.

bly vast machine, the *universe!* whose smallest wheels are globes, cogged with mountains, whose tops shooting upwards, would claim affinity with heaven, and whose bases rooted in the depths, would form the nadir to creation.

The poles are pivots. And ignited suns
Constrain the globes to move, the wheels to run.
The grand impetus to the whole is giv'n,
By Him who rules the earth, and reigns in heav'n.

Be ours the task, to wonder and adore;
Believe—rejoice—for faith can do no more;
This God is ours;—this wond'rous frame divine,
Is of the whole a sketch, a brief outline.

"Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it. Whither shall I go from thy spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, *thou* art there. If I make my bed in hell, behold, *thou* art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even *there* shall *thy hand* lead me, and thy *right hand* shall hold me."

Infinite wisdom has inscribed the goodness of God upon the page of time. And it is immutable, for it is copied from the annals of *eternity*.

If we raise our eyes, we behold the concave arch of heaven studded with stars, radiant with suns, and refulgent with glory. If we look around us, the verdant earth, spread with a rich profusion, and affording a supply for every creature, meets our admiring eyes, and proclaims the power, wisdom, and goodness of the universal Father, the God of the whole earth. Nature is eloquent in praise; man alone withholds the tribute. Nature is lavish of her gifts; man is parsimonious. Nature makes provision for all; man restrains her bounty, abuses her presents, poisons her cup of blessings, and destroys himself. This may well be called human nature, or nature perverted by man. This is the effect of finite impotence and folly. Reverse the picture, and the attributes of Deity are seen in the contrast. Almighty power made provision, Infinite wisdom suited it to the wants of the creature. Unbounded goodness extended it to all his works. Wisdom and goodness cannot be separated; they are always with God, and wherever they are seen, they are emanations from him.

A good man without wisdom, or a wise man without goodness, would be a greater phenomenon than has ever appeared in the world. Wisdom and goodness have nothing negative in them. If wisdom consisted in refraining from folly, and goodness in inactivity, or abstaining from evil, a stone would have the greatest claims to wisdom and goodness.

The almighty power of God is manifested in creation, by the infinite activity of his wisdom and goodness. And his unerring wisdom and unbounded goodness is manifested wherever his power is exercised. To say more than this, is impossible. To say less, would be impious. And whenever his goodness is called in question, or his wisdom doubted, in consequence of the occurrence of what is sometimes called natural evil, it amounts to demonstration, that the ignorance, or unbelief of the questioner, is the only difficulty; and that men "call good evil, and evil good; light darkness, and darkness light." There is an abundance of all that is necessary to satisfy the wants of every living creature; and the wants and deprivations of a part, does not proceed from the fact, that there is a deficency for the whole, but from the covetousness of those, who have heaped up more than they can enjoy themselves; and the malice of others, who destroy the provision made by God for his creatures, merely to gratify a depraved heart.

Wisdom and goodness are convertible terms; and folly and wickedness are convertible terms. Therefore it is impossible to conceive of the goodness of God as distinct from his wisdom, or his wisdom from his goodness. And his justice is but another name, for the harmony and union of the whole.—Men judge of cause from effect, and predicate effects from their knowledge of causes; and their judgment in either case must be correct, or incorrect, in proportion to their knowledge of facts. In our judgment of the dealings of God with his creatures, there is need of faith in the fullest extent of the term; but a blind unreasonable acquiescence on the part of man to the will and ways of God, never was required.

This alone would produce superstition and idolatry, and defeat every purpose which has any tendency to ameliorate the condition of man, and make him useful in society. "God has never left himself without a witness;" it is the strange and unnatural spirit of perversion which has found a place in the head and heart of all the human race, which is the cause; and unbelief, doubt and fear, are the consequence. Conceive of an earthly father's making provision for his children, and doing it in a manner expressive of love and affection for them, and they blind to his character, deaf to his promises, and strangers to his purposes; believe him to be "a hard man," and rob one another, until a part is unhappy from deprivation, and the rest from satiety, and the whole miserable; and you have a picture in miniature of the great family of man, a history of their sufferings, and an investigation of their causes.

Show me a poor wretch, suffering from deprivation and want, and I will show you his oppressor, laying a foundation by excess for sufferings as exquisite, and anguish as insupportable. The law of nature is the law of God. He that infringes one, violates the other; and the sufferings, in either case, are rather a consequence, than a penalty. Let it not be supposed that I am arguing the sufficiency of nature to teach man, independent of revelation; this would be gross folly, when we see thousands who will not learn from either. But I would lay the blame to man, rather than make the declaration, that God has not manifested himself in nature sufficiently plain, to satisfy any being of his wisdom, power and goodness, independent of all other testimony, did reason govern that being altogether. To reverse this would be impious. And to the digrace of man, he denies the testimony of all creation, and even perverts the Revelation and word of God himself.

The attributes of God are revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

Although theoretical Atheism is hunted from the Christian world, by an almost universal co-operation of all sects and parties, Deism is not unfashionable in theory, and with respect to practice, it is far more universal than is generally supposed. The Deist professes his disbelief in the scriptures, and denies the fact of there being a revelation from heaven; and strange to tell, there are millions who would regard a declaration to this effect with feelings bordering upon horror, whose practice would not only sanction theoretical Deism, but in many instances would disgrace the follower of the religion of nature, even when it is misunderstood and perverted. This is the strongest feature of inconsistency of principle and absurdity of practice that can be imagined; and the conduct of men in the ordinary concerns of life is a perfect satire upon their religious principles and practice. There never was a man in the possession of his mental faculties, who ever committed any crime which violated the laws of his country, without promising himself some signal profit or pleasure, and a prospect of eluding the law and its penalty, which amounted in the mind of the criminal to certainty. And there never was a man who believed the scriptures to be a revelation from heaven, and the denunciations against sin contained in them, to mean, in the fullest extent of the terms, endless misery, and that the consequence of committing sin, whoever would deliberately transgress the law of God. The Deist, who doubts the genuineness, or disbelieves the authenticity of the Bible, is far more consistent, to say the least, than the man who professes to believe it, and in practice gives the lie to his profession. Should any person doubt the truth of these premises, I would refer him to the testimony of God himself, who has declared, "I would thou wert cold or hot; and because thou art not cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." This, independent of any other testimony, ought to be sufficient to convince any, and every person who professes to believe the scriptures to be a revelation from heaven, that this temporizing and dissimulating propensity, in things of such vast and momentous import as the eternal welfare of the soul of man, is deserving of condemnation, detestation, and abhorrence.

If these premises are true, and I dare vouch for their correctness, there is a strong presumption in favour of the fact, that mankind generally do not understand the scriptures, and consequently do not believe the truths contained in them. And when it is taken into consideration, that there are many who openly profess their doubts and disbelief, the propriety of demonstrating that they are a revelation from heaven, is placed in the strongest light, and its necessity made obvious.

We say the propriety of demonstrating, and we think it can be done. If no other evidence could be adduced, than that which is considered by men in 99 cases out of an 100 as sufficient, when their property is at stake, and which would, in the proper acceptation of the term, amount only to proof, it ought to be sufficient; but we will take higher ground, and pledge ourselves to maintain it.

Although the want of a special revelation from heaven on the part of man, to assist him in his knowledge of God his Creator, and the reasonable presumption that God would make every communication of himself to man which could promote his welfare, or be necessary to his happiness, would in the opinion of every reasonable man amount to proof, that the scriptures were a revelation from God to man, especially when it is considered that they con-

tain rules and directions for every circumstance and condition of life, in which it is possible for man to be placed, whether prosperous or adverse; still, it is the part of a wise man to obtain all the evidence he can in every important question which can effect only his temporal welfare, and it would be absurd were he to reject, or slight testimony relative to an event, which concerned him throughout the wasteless ages of eternity.

In proving to a demonstration that the book called the Bible is a revelation from God, we shall confine ourselves principally to one fact, and its corresponding connexions. The dispersion of the people called Jews among all the nations of the earth, and their retaining their religion, manners and customs, is a fact so singular, as to have excited the surprise of men in every age, during a period of almost two thousand years. It is an *effect* which must have had a *cause*. And without that cause was foreign to human agency, and unproduced by human means, other nations would, by being placed in similar circumstances, have experienced the same effects. It can be proved, that cause and consequence must take place, and one follow the other; and here we have a wonderful instance of an event, which soars above proof, and demands demonstration, even to account for that, which is too palpable to be denied, even by a skeptic. Let every thing which is considered by mankind as proof, be brought forward and put in one scale, and the evidence we shall produce in this case be put in the other, and its preponderance will be in proportion to its dissimilarity, and the effect will be the criterion to measure the magnitude of the cause. We say it amounts to demonstration that there is a Creator, because there is the created; "for nothing cannot be a cause." And producing this effect, which has astonished mankind for so many ages, we demand the cause; a cause, equal to the effect, and rest the matter upon this simple question, whether, an effect which required a supernatural cause, foreign to human agency, and superior to the effect, could have been predicted by a creature, or being inferior to the effect.

"It is impossible for a thing to be, and have an existence, and not to be, and have no existence at the same time." This is a truth, or axiom so plain, that no man *can* deny it. It is *impossible*. And it is equally impossible for an inferior finite being to foreknow and predict a superior, infinite effect; and that must be infinite, which is not finite; and God being infinite, and there being only Infinite and finite, or Creator and created, whatever is superior to created, must belong to, and proceed from the Creator.

We know of no absolute necessity, why the Jews should have been dispersed and scattered among all the nations of the earth, much less that they should retain their religion, manners and customs, and their national identity for so many ages. But we feel the absolute necessity of the truth of that prediction, which for nearly two thousand years has pursued them to the four quarters of the globe, and declared the history in the most minute respects of nearly a hundred generations of men, before they had an existence; and that history, predicted in terms altogether dissimilar from the common, and with their exception, from the universal history of mankind. There is not a Deist who has any regard for his reputation as a man of common sense, and possessed of common reason, who will deny the antiquity of this prophecy relative to the Jews, other, than by acknowledging the fact of their singular dispersion, with all the unaccountable circumstances attending it, relative to length of time, peculiarity of religious sentiment, and the persecutions they have suffered; and declaring that the prophecy was written after the event took place. If this were admitted, it would by no means derogate from the merit of the prediction, for it would be a prediction still; for they are willing, or are obliged by the united voice and testimony of more than 50 generations of men, to acknowledge the antiquity of this prophetic history, and are driven to the miserable subterfuge of declaring the probability of the history of any nation for a short term of time, being their history "*ad infinitum*," without any possibility of mistake, error, or incorrectness.

It is astonishing, to examine the writings of distinguished Deists, to observe the evidence and testimony they receive on other subjects, and their readiness to attach implicit credit to these; and contrast this evidence and testimony with this irresistible and demonstrable truth, which they with so much pertinacity deny. This one fact, independent of any thing else, is more than sufficient to destroy all their objections, and stamp them with inconsistency, absurdity, and folly. It therefore follows as a consequence, that wherever there is a Jew, there is an incontrovertible evidence in favour of the truth of the declaration, that "the scriptures of the Old and New Testament are a revelation from heaven." That similar causes which to our conception may appear human, will not account for the dispersion of the Jews, one case remarkably similar will be sufficient to prove. The same power, that of Rome, which destroyed the city of Jerusalem, destroyed Carthage; and the destruction of the latter was as effectual as that of the former; although the distress of the Jews was heightened by the length of the siege, and their intestine divisions, yet the ruin of the two cities, as places convenient for residence, was similar. And strange to relate, Jerusalem is inhabited to this day by strangers; and Carthage has scarce a stone left, to tell where it stood. And, stranger still, the Jews are here—there—and everywhere. The Carthaginians—where are they? and their posterity, have they continued until this day? Where are the mighty armies who deluged Sicily, threatened Rome with destruction, and the terror of whose name made the surrounding nations tremble? Where are the hosts, who manned the fleets, which covered the waters of the Mediterranean, and threatened Italy with subjugation and conquest? They are gone.—Not one solitary individual can be found to lend his support to the tottering temple of infidelity, or countenance the infidel in his sacriligious war.

(To be continued.)

Communication.

It is much to be lamented, that the ideas of many sincere professors of the Christian religion are divided in the worship of the only one, true, and living God.

In many parts of the four Evangelists our blessed Lord endeavours to explain himself, and to inform us, who and what He is, as well as to show the great necessity of his coming into the world, both to preserve the angels in heaven, and to effect the salvation of men upon earth.

The Evangelist St. John informs us, he declared, that He that had seen Him, (the Lord Jesus Christ) had seen the Father, chap. xiv. 9th verse; and St. Paul declares, that in Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, Colossians, chap. ii. 9th verse. These are at once uniting the Trinity in one divine person, that of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

To belive in the Lord's divine humanity is the first and most essential of all doctrines. And to live an humble life of mutual love and charity, from the Lord, is the sum and substance of all his commandments, both to angels in heaven and men upon earth.

There is but one true and living God, in whom is a divine Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is that only God in his divine humanity, Creator from eternity, Redeemer in time, and Regenerator for evermore; whose divinity is the Father, whose humanity is the Son, and whose operation is the Holy Ghost; and consequently, who is the only object of all Christian worship and adoration; and to whom alone we ought to ascribe all glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

WILLIAM POWNALL.

New-York, April 17th, 1820.

Our correspondent's remark, that Christ came "both to preserve the angels in Heaven, and to effect the salvation of men upon earth," leads to the conjecture, that he has adopted the opinion which for some time has obtained credit with a few, "that there are no angels in heaven, but what were once men upon earth." In Genesis iii. chap. 24th verse, we read, that when God drove Adam out of the garden of Eden, he placed "cherubims and a flaming sword, which turned every way to keep the tree of life." Were these cherubims angels? and if they were, who were their prototypes?—

The following extract, from the Rev. Dr. M'Leod's Lectures, page 455, is in a style and manner, which makes comment unnecessary. "Go thou and do likewise."

"The Son of God neither condemns, nor justifies by halves. Let the advocates of an *atonement* which does not *expiate*, or of an *expiation* which does not *redeem*, or of a *redemption* which does not *save* the *soul*, amuse themselves in tearing asunder the seamless robe of the mediatory righteousness; the scriptures still teach, that *He who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up to the death for us all, will with him also freely give us all things!*"

The wisdom of this world, or human consistency and agreement.

"If these things are of men, they shall come to nought."—*Scripture.*

Calvinism.—"If God really intended the salvation of all men; then no man can perish. *For the counsel of the Lord standeth forever.*, Psalm xxiii. 11. If Christ died for all, and all are not saved, the purposes of his death are in many instances frustrated, and he shed his

precious blood in vain. To suppose this, would be derogatory to the infinite perfections of the great Redeemer. Therefore, he did not die for all, and all for whom he died will certainly be saved."

Hopkinsianism, refined.—"The atonement of Christ is adapted to all, and sufficient for all, and irrespective of the divine purpose as to its application,* made as much for one man as another."

Revelation.—"He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for *ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.*"

TRAITS OF CHRISTIAN CHARACTER.

Selected.

Man by the fall is become an enemy to himself; that creature which loves itself with care, and cannot support the lingering torment of its own society. Deprived of its true and sovereign object, it feels nothing within itself, but an immense void, and inexhaustible fund of misery. The mind is continually agitated like a tempestuous ocean with trifling ideas, wandering imaginations and incongruous phantoms. The heart is torn to pieces by false fears, false hopes, and yet falser loves. All the efforts man makes abroad to amuse and please himself, are to hinder him from feeling this mighty void within. So soon as he turns himself to his infinite object, he begins to reconcile himself. Cured of wild ambition, impure lust, cruel hatred, dire vengeance, impetuous wrath, black envy, tormenting jealousy; freed from all the irascible and concupiscible passions, feels inward peace, serenity, and joy. By degrees the noise of sense and imagination cease, as does the tumult of false reasoning, the enchantments of passion, the itch of curiosity, and all the inquietudes of self-love. The soul enters by little and little into the spiritual rest and sabbath of the Lord; where in imitation of its supreme original, external activity does not hinder repose within. What can disturb the peace of a soul, that quietly receives from the hands of God every thing that happens; that adores the infinite power, wisdom, and goodness which orders or permits all human events; that looks upon life as a dream, the earth as an exile, heaven as its country, and the infinite being as its only object; that lives continually in the divine presence, while it breathes, desires, and loves nothing but the accomplishment of the divine will in all things? Prosperity cannot elevate such a man, nor adversity crush him. He makes use of the one to show his beneficence, and of the other to give an example of patience.

Hence Christianity is the true road to happiness in this life, as well as in the next; because it produces in us not the Stoic apathy, which is impossible, and would be inhuman; but a perfect submission to the divine will. The Christian philosopher regulates his passions, but he is not insensible; he vanquishes them, but he feels them. True virtue rectifies nature without destroying it.

Hence all those who do not feel this peace of mind, inward serenity, and joy in the Holy Ghost, are yet novices in the spiritual life, or unfaithful to the divine inspirations. They torment themselves with vain reflections upon what is past, with anxious precautions about what is to come, and do not know how to enjoy the actual moment in the divine presence as the best and properest that could befall them, since all is ordered and regulated by unerring wisdom and paternal goodness.

Persuaded that God alone can enlighten the understanding and change the heart, he tolerates all men, as God tolerates them; and yet without deeming all indifferent, doubtful or lawful. Filled with one desire, one object, and one love; he reduces all his speculations, studies, and sciences, to one great principle, which is the knowledge and love of eternal order.

The sovereign love of justice produces in him all noble setiments and heroic virtues. He gives not only to every man his due; but he sacrifices himself, and divests himself of all, when the love of justice demands it. He does not look upon himself as an independent being made for himself alone; but as a member of that universal republic of which God is the common head and father. He fulfils thereby the laws of nature and nations, prefers always public to private interest, and never seeks his particular good, but in the general good of the whole, or in so far as it is compatible with the laws of eternal order. He loves his family more than himself, his country more than his family, human kind more than his country, the totality of beings more than the human species; and the Being of beings more than all his creatures. In whatever state he is, therewith he is content, knowing that all is regulated by the laws of eternal wisdom and goodness. He envies no man, covets nothing; jealousy has no empire over his soul. He sees in others talents, virtues, and perfections, honours, riches, temporal and intellectual advantages, with pleasure, complacency and joy, as if he possessed them himself; because he looks upon all as the wise dispensations of an unerring wisdom, that regulates all with number, weight and measure. He loves the employment that providence has given him, and strives therein to excel, by all the means that are conformable to justice. If he be a king or a prince, he exerts the duties of that station without affecting the virtues of a retired and obscure life. If he is a statesman or a magistrate, he founds all his politics upon justice; and pursues his ends without the low, vulgar artifices of a little mind. If he be a general of an army or a soldier, he looks upon himself as the executor of divine justice by war; but he banishes all private views, false glory, unbridled ambition, barbarous cruelty and unjust exactions. His courage is invincible, because he looks upon life as a dream, and rejoices when providence orders him to quit this dark prison of flesh, and tragical theatre of life, by the noble sacrifice of himself for his country. If he is preferred to ecclesiastical employments, he looks upon himself as a physician of souls, and endeavours to cure their errors and vices, not by authority, which overpowers without conviction, but by soft persuasion, which gains the heart. If he be born in a state of dependence, he is content with his humiliation, indigence and poverty. In short, in whatever state he is, he fulfils all the duties of it as other men do, but from a nobler and purer principle.

Remarks on the intercession of Christ.

By intercession is generally understood, one person's using entreaties to a second, on behalf of a third; and this is generally applied to Christ, as interceding with the Father for sinners. Isaiah 53, 12, it is said, "He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." In 59th chapter, 16th verse, "And he saw that *there was* no man, and wondered that *there was* no intercessor; therefore his arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness it sustained him." Hebrew 7, 25, "therefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Christ bore the sin of many when on the cross, and there made intercession, saying, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." At that time he "saw there was no intercessor, therefore his arm brought salvation unto him." To intercede is to save; intercession and salvation, therefore, are convertible terms when applied to Christ. To deny this, is to deny his power. To say that he did not intercede for only a part, is to make that part, for whom he did not intercede, without sin, and consequently not needing any intercession, for the declaration is that he made intercession for the *transgressors.* Again, read the testimony of Paul; "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." For whom? *Ans.* for transgressors. *I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. He shall be feared as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth; all kings shall fall down before him; he shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence: His name shall endure forever; men shall be blessed in him.*

An Important Question.

The Scriptures declare, he that believeth shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned. If this damnation which is here spoken of, mean "endless misery," what construction will you put upon the declaration, that God hath concluded *all* in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon ALL?

"*Rebuke a wise man, and he will love you.*"

To all whom it may concern.

The word *damnation* occurs but *ten* times in the whole scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. And the word *damned*, but *three* times. While the word SALVATION is mentioned ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY times!!

N. B. How many times are the words damnation, and damned, mentioned in one *sermon?*

To Subscribers.

Those of our subscribers who change their place of residence on Monday next, May 1st, and who have not notified the carrier of this paper of their intention to remove, are respectfully requested to send the number of their new residence, and the name of the street, in writing, to the office 93 Gold St. or to 454 Pearl St. early the ensuing week.

To Correspondents.

All Communications forwarded the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD STREET.

* "If they are not elected, they will indeed perish; and a *part* are elected."

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1820. NO. 3.

The Attributes of God, as revealed in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(*Concluded.*)

It is essential to a true faith in God, that we should "believe that He is." Which faith or belief must, to be rational, have a distinct idea of indentity, whether we conceive of personality, as a being evident to the senses, or conceivable by the mind as an Absolute, Infinite spirit, or cause, whom we believe to be the Creator of all things. We must conceive something, or we cannot believe any thing. For it is impossible for a man to believe that, of which he knows nothing. Or in other words, it is impossible to take any thing, or principle, into consideration, of which we are perfectly ignorant.

God is an infinite being. Man is a finite being. A finite being cannot search and find out an Infinite Being, therefore man cannot have a true knowledge of God, any further than God has revealed himself to him. God has declared his unity in the most positive terms, and we hazard the assertion, that the scriptures contain no positive declaration to the contrary. And if God declares his unity positively, what right has man to declare the contrary from inference. "*I am God*, and beside me there is none else; look unto *Me* and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for *I am God*, and besides *Me* there is no *Saviour*. The Lord thy God is one Lord." Can words be more plain? can language be more expressive? And can it be possible that in this enlightened age, famed for theological knowledge and Christian charity, that the thunders of the orthodox church, and even the invectives of the humble are hurled with inquisitorial vengeance at the man who shall dare profess his open and unqualified belief in them? What if the secular arm has destroyed the engines of torture, and paralized the efforts of the infuriated persecutor, whose maddened zeal would light the faggot, and send the heretical dissenter, in screams and flame, to an imagined torment, greater in their distempered imagination than their ingenuity, assisted by a zeal, ignited by all the rage and fury of mistaken holiness could inflict: Is there no foe? No weapon left? If there is a foe, he is as impotent as error is groundless; and safety is as certain, as truth is eternal.

"Believe, or die!" was the declaration of Mahomet, when with the *Alcoran* in one *hand*, and the *sword* in the other, he attempted to propagate human doctrines. "Father, forgive them! for they know not what they do," was the declaration of Christ, when his hands were nailed by his enemies, yet by the sufferer considered as engraven with love, with compassion for a guilty world. Whatever partakes of this spirit, is allied to *Heaven*. The reverse of this, is the spirit of *hell*. They are Antipodes. And from whatever motive any man may attempt to reconcile them, whatever of harmony he may expect to result from this unnatural combination, he is, though he may be ignorant, taking the side of the adversary and enemy of man. If salvation, or life eternal, is the consequence of knowing God, and Christ makes this declaration, what is there that men call good, and which this world can afford, which deserves to be put in competition with this knowledge? And what folly can be greater than that of denying our principles through fear, or placing them "like a candle under a bushel," lest we should be known, and lose the favour—of whom? Of poor impotent man; who, while his hand is lifted in anger, may himself fall a victim to the moth.

If sincerity is necessary and commendable in any thing, it is in a man's acknowledgment of his religious sentiments. And if dissimulation is reprehensible in common things of little moment, it is proportionable more in that, which of all concerns is incomparably the greatest.

"For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind. Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner; but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God." This is the advice of Paul to Timothy. "Put not your trust in man," is the advice of the prophet. "Fear not man," is the declaration of Christ.

If there is but one God, the Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier of all things, hear him. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." This is the requirement of Almighty God; and if idolatry consists in worshipping idols, are not those idolaters who worship three gods? Reader, lay aside all prejudice, open your Bible, recollect that the three gods who are worshipped in these modern times, are of human origin. The scriptures testify, that "There is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven, or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Christ is this God, or Creator, this Lord, or Master. "The Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall He be called."

From whence proceeded these gods, equal in power, and separate in identity? Were they not generated in the council at Trent? Suppose a council of clergymen should convene in New-York, and declare that there were two gods and no more, and no less; or if you please, two gods and an half; ridiculous and absurdly impious as this would be, we believe it would find many adherents; and it would be more reasonable, than the present doctrine of three gods. For in proportion as you reduce the number, you approximate to the truth. And reason and truth are never at variance; and if three can be one, and one three, two and an half can be one likewise; and one, two and an half.

There is not in reason, nature or revelation, any thing to authorize a belief in three gods. The scriptures are decidedly against the very idea of such a thing; and if the offices or methods, which God in his providence may take, to manifest himself to the comprehension of his creatures, that he may, by revealing himself to their sense and capacities, promote their happiness, are to be considered as distinct from God, and deified; we might on the same principle make as many gods as there are distinct substances in the universe, or ideas in the mind.

John, in his first epistle, 5th chapter, 7th verse, says, "there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." As if John had anticipated the error, which should gain ground in the world at a future time, and with a view to prevent the possibility of misconstruing his declaration, he adds, "and these three are one." Or in other words, I do not mean three Gods, or three persons* in identity, but only one God. What is it to bear record, but to testify to the truth of any thing? And if every person was to be deified, who was to testify to the truth; our gods would be more numerous than the gods of the Heathens. "The testimony of Jesus, is the spirit of prophecy." Consequently the testimony of Jesus, is the record of Jesus. The prophet Isaiah, speaking of Christ, says, "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Suppose the prophet had added, and these five are one God; he would have declared the truth; and the Council at Trent would have added two more to their imaginary deities.

It is notorious that the ancient heathen nations sought safety in the multiplicity of their gods. They counted them by hundreds; and every extraordinary occurrence which created a new fear, produced a new deity. Which occasioned the remark of one of their philosophers, that "fear made the first gods." It is natural for the weak to seek safety in numbers, from a common and correct opinion, that "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety." Which sentiment, by a strange perversion, has been applied even to God himself.

"I am God, and beside me there is none else;" is the declaration of the Almighty Creator. "There are three *distinct* persons in the Godhead, the same in substance, equal

* The term *person* never once occurs in the New Testament, as applied to the Deity. In our English translation the term is adopted, where it is said of the Son of God, that *He is the express image of His*, the Father's *person*. Heb. 1. 3. But the original word here rendered *person*, is *hypostasis*, which ought properly to have been rendered *substance*. It is further to be observed, that the Greek term, *prosopon*, which we render *person*, is always applied to express the *face* or *aspect* of a thing, and that the Latin term, *persona*, is accordingly used to express what we mean by *character*.

in power and glory," is the declaration of the council at Trent. Consider for a moment that the words distinct, and separate, are perfectly synonymous in their meaning, which is a fact, although modern use has made a theological difference, for it is impossible for any thing to be distinct, without being separated from every thing else; or to be separated from every thing, without being distinct from every thing; and read, "there are three separate persons, each possessing almighty power, and the same in substance; and you make three Gods as completely, and define their separate capacities, and indentify their persons, as much so, as ever the idolatrous heathens did their gods; and it is as completely idolatary to worship three gods, as it would be to worship three thousand. There is but ONE Almighty God. All other deities, call them by what name you please, and identify their persons, or properties, or attributes as you will, still they are the *creatures* of your own imagination, and are equally unworthy of homage, undeserving of praise, and as gods, too contemptible from impotence to excite the smallest fear.

This absolute infinite being, who is the God of the whole earth, and who *alone* is deserving of praise and adoration, never did, nor never will, manifest himself to his creatures, in any other, and only in the ONE Person, Jesus Christ, the divine humanity, or Immanuel, God with us; "who is God over all, the same to-day, yesterday, and forever;" and who declared, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father, and the Father dwelleth in me, and I in him." If we examine the prophets, we shall find that their declarations are unanimous relative to Almighty God, as the Creator and Judge of the world. And if we look at the testimony of Christ and his apostles, we shall find that Jesus, the Saviour, is the Creator and Judge. Let every man who professes to believe the scriptures to be a revelation from heaven, and to be truth, ask himself this question; are these declarations truth; ought I not to believe them, in preference to the declarations of any man, or number of men, let their characters or professions be what they may? There is no other possible alternative but to believe this truth, if you would be consistent and reasonable; for to disbelieve it would be to give God the lie direct. It is in vain for a man to qualify his faith, by saying, I believe there are three persons, but I do not mean there are three God's; which sentiment, couch it in what terms you please, amounts to nothing more or less than this; I am in the habit of saying one thing, but then I always mean something else. This is the price, which is voluntarily paid by thousands to preserve their orthodoxy.

The grand inconsistency of this modern hypothesis, remains yet to be told. Notwithstanding the positive declaration, that these "three persons are the same in substance, and *equal in power;*" yet we are gravely told, that one Almighty person is angry, and the second Almighty person is trying to appease and pacify him; and the third Almighty person is employed in solacing and comforting those, against whom the anger of the first Almighty person is directed; and all this, even after the second Almighty person had died to appease that anger, but his death was not effectual. It is astonishing, that mankind do not see the horrible impiety and inconsistency of this doctrine. It represents, first, three Gods. Second, these three Gods at variance. Third, one of the three Gods dies, to appease the wrath or anger of another of these Gods. Fourth, finding that his death had not answered the purpose effectually, he is trying by persuasion to pacify him. And fifth, the third God is sent to reconcile man to his fate, and comfort him, until the anger of the first named God abates. And wonderful to tell, they each of them possess the same power and glory. I am sensible that some men will charge me with impiety, if not blasphemy. I have only to say, in my defence, that the Almighty Maker and Father and Creator of all worlds, is quite a different being from any of those imaginary deities above mentioned. And that not one word I have written, as applicable to them, has the least possible reference to him, for his *name* and *nature* "*is love,*" and he is unchangeable.

The characters and attributes of these Trentian deities, are precisely the characters and attributes of fallen degraded man; with the exception of the second deity in their list, who is represented as too humane to be compared to man, while he sustains his present character; but he is frequently described as sustaining his affectionate forbearing disposition and character, only for a time; and that he will finally be wrathful and implacable himself. It is not uncommon to see men angry, and some of their fellows, better natured at the time than themselves, trying to pacify them; and it very frequently happens, that they meet with success; but should they fail, and the angry man retain his wrath for a great length of time, it is more than probable his neighbours would lose their good opinions of him. And is it possible that passions which would disgrace a man, are attributable to gods? "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," is the first command in the decalogue. And we believe, that no man living who knows the true character and attributes of the great lawgiver, will have the least inclination to have any other. The character which this great and good Being gives of himself, is too plain and explicit to be misunderstood, if there exists in the mind of the inquirer a willingness to relinquish his errors and embrace the truth, in the love of it.

He has declared that he is the Lord, "the Lord God, gracious and merciful, slow to anger, abundant in goodness, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin. That he will not cast off forever, but according to the multitude of his mercies he will have compassion, for he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." And his immutability is guaranteed by his own declaration, "For I am the Lord; I change not."

The wisdom of God, is revealed to man in the scriptures, in the plainest and strongest language, and represented as eternal. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before the works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there was no depths, I was brought forth; when there was no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills, was I brought forth. When he prepared the heavens, I was there, when he set a compass upon the face of the depth. When he established the clouds above, when he strengthened the fountains of the deep. When he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment; when he appointed the foundations of the earth. Then I was by him, as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him. Rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men."

His power is defined, for he is called Almighty. "All things were made by him, and for him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." His justice is declared, and its effects explained. "I am God, and besides me there is none else; a just God and Saviour; a just God, having salvation; a just God, and the justifier of the ungodly."

The purity of his character is represented, when it is said, "He is too pure to behold iniquity. The harmony and unity of all his attributes and perfections are explained and summed up, in the divine declaration, "GOD IS LOVE." The reason why his creatures should worship him, is stated when they are called to adore him. "Praise the Lord, for he is good; because his mercy endureth *forever.*"

As the dazzling spendour of the noon-day sun exceeds the feeble glimmer of the glow-worm, who flitters at summer's eve, so the transcendent glories of this divine God of love, exceeds the doubtful and ignoble purposes, and soars on the triumphant wings of mercy, above the feeble deities and imaginary gods, who, whether they have emerged from the crucible of the founder, the chisel of the statuary, the axe of the woodman, or the disordered imagination of the unbeliever, are alike impotent in power, inconsistent in reason, and absurd in goodness. "If Baal be God, serve him. But if the Lord be God, serve him." Contrast the Almighty power, infinite wisdom, and unbounded goodness, of the one only living and true God, with the doubtful authority, indecision of action, and malignity of purpose, which characterize the imaginary gods, whose imputed attributes and purposes have unhinged society, unsheathed the sword, made man the enemy of man, distracted the world with commotions, and deluged the earth with blood.

The language of idolatrous worshippers is obscure, false and doubtful. The declarations of the only living and true God, are plain, true, and consolatory. "Thy Maker is thy husband; the God of the whole earth shall he be called. I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; lest the spirits should fail before me, and the souls that I have made. Look unto me, all the ends of the earth, and be ye saved, for I am God, and besides me there is none else. As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth. Sing, O heavens, and be joyful, O earth, and break forth into singing, O mountains; for the Lord hath comforted his people, and will have mercy upon his afflicted. But Zion said, the Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea they may forget; yet will I not forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me." Therefore, "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord; my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation; he hath covered me with a robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth

herself with her jewels. For as the earth bringeth forth her bud, and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth, so the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth, before ALL THE *NATIONS*."

N. B. *To the reader.* "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good;" is the advice of "Paul, the servant of Christ." Reason teaches us, that the sayings of God must be true. We are commanded by Christ when we pray, to say "our Father which art in heaven." Christ again speaks of himself and says, "no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man which is in heaven." You will observe that Christ while on earth, here speaks of himself as being in heaven, consequently he declares himself to be the Father. Again, Christ says, I and my Father are one, not two, or three. The declaration is *positive* that Christ is the Creator of all things. The humanity, or human body, he veiled his glories in, that he might manifest himself to the world he made; and dwelling in that body, he was Immanuel or God with us; and that body or blood being a part of the human family, he being the Creator and consequently Father of all, mankind are, wonderful to relate, his brethren; he the head, they the other members. And he the head rendered perfect obedience to his law, in their stead and for them, that his righteousness might be theirs, and he as the "head of every man," died for every man, and "destroyed death and him that had the power of death," and rose from the dead, which resurrection was the destruction of death; for he "led captivity captive," or led death, the *gaoler*, who until that time kept mankind prisoners in the grave, a captive. And mankind, agreeably to the declaration of Paul, have "risen with him," a spiritual resurrection to eternal life in the Son of God, "who is the same to-day, yesterday, and forever." This can be proved expressly from the scriptures, beyond the possibility of *refutation*.

"Herein is love, not that we love him, but that he first loved us." Unto the ONE ONLY TRUE AND LIVING GOD, THE ETERNAL FATHER, who clothed himself in our flesh, and reconciled us to himself by his body, as our elder brother, on the cross, and who will, in his own good time, purify us by the operation of his holy Spirit, and write his law upon our hearts; be ascribed all the HONOUR, AND GLOLY, DOMINION, AND POWER, FOREVER, AMEN.

COMMUNICATION.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

As the Unitarian doctrine is gaining ground in this city, and as it deprives religion of its very essence, and removes the corner stone of Christianity; I have taken some extracts from a very able and new work, that I have in my possession, against this heresy, which I now forward you for publication, provided it shall meet your approbation.

On the Testimony of Prophecy, in regard to the Divine Person and Character of Jesus Christ.

That this testimony is of importance in deciding on the person and character of Jesus Christ, is evident from what Jesus Christ himself declares concerning it, as where he says to the Jews, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me." (John v. 39.) And again, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me." (Verse 46.) To the same purpose it is written in the Evangelist, that Jesus, after his resurrection, "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded to them (his two disciples) in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself." (Luke xxiv. 27.) He also reproves their want of belief in the prophets, where he says, in the preceding verse 25, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken!" Again, towards the end of the same chapter, he says to the rest of his disciples, "These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." (Verse 44.) And immediately it is added, "Then opened he their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures." (Verse 45.) By which is manifestly meant, that he enabled them to see how all the Scriptures, viz. the law of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms, had immediate reference to himself.

In presenting this prophetic testimony to your view, it is not my intention to adduce the whole of it, because that would be to write a Volume, and not a Letter, and therefore I shall content myself with adverting to the most striking and convincing parts of it. For this reason I shall not dwell on the prophetic declaration in the third chapter of Genesis, where it is said by the Almighty to the serpent, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel;" (verse 15.) nor yet on the prophecy of Jacob, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be;" (Gen. xlix. 10.) nor yet on that of Balaam, "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh; there shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall arise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. Out of Jacob shall come He that shall have dominion." (Numb. xxiv. 17, 19.) I shall not, I say, insist particularly on any of the above predictions, though it might easily be shown that they all point to the Great Saviour, and have always been regarded as extraordinary testimonies concerning him It might also be shown, that they all point to the appearing, on earth, of a Being more than mortal, since to bruise the head of the serpent, to gather the people, to smite the corners of Moab, and to have dominion, are expressions which, according to their spiritual and genuine meaning, must have reference to some act of an Omnipotent Being, and, consequently, not to the agency of a mere man.

But, passing by these testimonies, which yet are not to be lightly esteemed, let us proceed to the book of Psalms, a book which, it has been already seen, from the express declaration of Jesus Christ, has reference to himself. In the second psalm we read these remarkable words, "I will declare the decree; the Lord (JEHOVAH*) hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." (Verses 7, 8.) And then it presently follows, "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and so ye perish from the right way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." (Verse 12.) These words, it is to be noted, according to the authority of the sacred writers themselves, have reference to Jesus Christ. (See Acts xiii. 33. Heb. I. 5. chap. v. 5.)

Now I would ask any serious considerate person, who believes the above words to be the words of God, whether it be at all conceivable, that the Son there spoken of, can be a mere man, or indeed can be any being less than a God? For how can the Lord, or JEHOVAH, say of a mere man, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? How, again, can it be said of a mere man, I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession? And again, with what propriety or meaning can we be exhorted to kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and so we perish from the right way, if by the Son here spoken of, be understood a mere human being like ourselves? And lastly, how could it be said, Blessed are all they that put their trust in him, unless the being here alluded to be the Divine Being? For who but the Divine Being can be the allowable object of our trust, and what blessedness can possibly be derived from putting our trust in any other?

So again, we find it written in the 45th Psalm, "Thou art fairer than the children of men; grace is poured into thy lips, therefore God hath blessed thee for ever. Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty," &c. &c. (Verses 2, 3, 4, 5.) It then follows in the next verses, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness, therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." (Verses 6, 7.) What judgment now must every serious and considerate reader form of these passages? A Being is here spoken of, who is fairer than the children of men, to whom are ascribed many wonderful works. It is then said of this Being, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre; and it then follows, therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. How strange and mysterious is the mode of expression here adopted! God is said to anoint God, which mode of expression can have no possible meaning, unless when applied to the Incarnate God, or God manifest in the flesh; but when so applied, what sanctity, what wisdom, what edification, does it involve! For how forcibly does it impress upon our minds the great evangelical truth, that Jesus Christ, the fairest of the children of men, that only begotten of the Father, was finally, when his victories over the powers of darkness were completed, made one with the Father, and by that union was exalted to everlasting dominion over heaven and the church! It therefore follows in the same psalm, that he is the Supreme Object of worship in the church, and that all the

* It may be proper to inform the reader, who is unacquainted with the original Hebrew, that the term JEHOVAH, in the original, is uniformly rendered, in our English version, by the term Lord.

members of the church are obliged to acknowledge him as such. For thus it is further written, "Hearken, O daughter, and consider, incline thine ear; forget also thine own people and thy father's house. So shall the King greatly desire thy beauty; for he is thy Lord; and worship thou him." (Verses 10, 11.)

Let us turn now to the 72d psalm, where we shall be again struck with the same conviction, that Jesus Christ, by uniting in himself the Divine Nature and the human, for the purpose of saving mankind, so far from being a mere man, can be no other than the one eternal God of heaven and earth. For who, that reads the following words, and recollects that they are the words of God, can possibly believe them to relate to any merely human being of this world? "Give the king thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness unto the king's son. He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with judgment. They shall fear thee so long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. He shall have the dominion also from sea to sea, and from the rivers unto the ends of the earth. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him. He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence; he shall live, and to him shall be given of the gold of Sheba; prayer also shall be made for him continually, and daily shall he be praised. His name shall endure for ever, and men shall be blessed in him; all nations shall call him blessed." (Verses 1 to 18.) Had we met with such words in any human composition, we might perhaps have supposed, and reasonably, that they were intended to be complimentary to some great earthly monarch, and were accordingly written in an exaggerated and bombast style of metaphorical allusion. But it is to be considered, that the words are the words of God, and therefore must be expressive of truth, and not of compliment; of reality, and not of exaggeration. We are forced then to conclude, that they have reference to Jesus Christ, who, as to his human nature, is here called the king's son. For of what other king's son can it be said, in any truth and reality, that he shall judge the people of God with righteousness, and the poor of God with judgment; that he shall be feared as long as the sun and moon endure throughout all generations; that he shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the rivers unto the ends of the earth; that all kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him; that he shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence; that his name shall endure for ever, and men shall be blessed in him? Applied then to any other king's son than Jesus Christ, the words never have been accomplished, and never can be accomplished in that truth and reality which all the words of God involve; but applied to Jesus Christ, the Son of the King of kings, they have been fulfilled, are fulfilling, and will be fulfilled to all eternity.

In the 89th psalm, again, you will find a similar testimony respecting the union of the Divine and human natures in Jesus Christ, under the figurative character of David, for it is written, in the mysterious language of that divine psalm, "For JEHOVAH is our defence, the holy one of Israel is our king. Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy one, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty, I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him." (Verses 18, 19, 20.) Now that by David in this passage is not meant David the king of the Jews, but he who was figured by David, viz. Jesus Christ in his humanity, is evident from what follows concerning him, where it is written, "Also I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven." (Verses 27, 28, 29.) Now we know that the seed and throne of David, the king of the Jews, did not endure for ever, and therefore we are forced to conclude, that the promise related to him who was here figured by David, even to Jesus Christ. Accordingly the Apostle Peter, in his admirable address to the Jews, (Acts ii.) applies to Jesus Christ what David said concerning himself in the 16th psalm, where it is written, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." (Verse 10.) It is plain, therefore, from the testimony of the apostles, that Jesus Christ was prefigured by David.

(To be continued.)

"*Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me.*" *John* v. 39.

It is very common for men to search diligently for money, or any earthly good which they may have lost, or which they wish to obtain, and think it can be found by searching. But the common manner of reading the scriptures, whatever name you may please to call it by, is very different from searching, especially if we take the above mentioned figure as a comparison, and we think it is a very just one. Did Christ tell the Jews to search the scriptures to find damnation, or *eternal life?* Do men in these days examine the scriptures with a view to find eternal life? And if they do, is it to find it for themselves alone, or for others? Is it as common for the promises of God to be quoted, as the threatenings? And when the promises are quoted, are they not confined to those who quote them, or their sect, or party; and the threatenings against sin, applied to their neighbours? Is it not common, when the will of God is referred to as affording consolation on account of his willing the salvation of all men, to hear the contrary declared, and other portions of his word brought forward, with the manifest purpose to prove that what God has declared to be his will, is not his will? And is this the spirit of Christ, or antichrist? Is this "gathering with Christ, or scattering abroad?" "*As the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it. For you shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace; the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field* shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn, shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree; and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign, that shall not be cut off.*"

* Christ declares, that "the field is the world." And we believe commentators are generally agreed, that by trees, in this passage, men are meant.

"*The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.* *Psalm* ix. 17.

This is often quoted, with a view to prove, that a large portion of the human race will be eternally miserable. The original Hebrew word in the text is *scheol*, and generally means grave, which is the meaning in this place. The preceding verse in the psalm, puts this beyond a doubt. "The Lord is known; the judgment he executeth. The wicked is snared in the work of his own hands." The words *by* and *which*, in our translation, are a complete perversion; they are supplied by the translators, and confound the sense of the whole passage. The wicked destroy themselves, and turn, or force themselves into the grave. But, "the Lord is known." And we know him to be merciful, and believe him, when he declares, "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth." "The judgment he executeth." How does God execute judgment? "Hearken unto me, my people; and give ear unto me, O my nation; for a law shall proceed from me, and I will make my judgment to rest for a *light* for the people. My righteousness is near; my *salvation* is gone forth, and mine *arms* shall *judge* the people; the isles shall wait upon me, and on mine *arm* shall they trust." The word, *scheol* sometimes is applied to designate a state of doubt, fear and uncertainty, a state of mental darkness and suffering. The prophet declares, "thou has delivered my soul from the lowest hell." It is impossible for any one, who believes the prophet to have spoken the truth, to doubt the possibility of a man's being delivered, from even the lowest hell. And if a man believes the scriptures, he must acknowledge the possibility of a man's being in *hell* FOR EVER, and coming out safe at last. See the book of the prophet *Jonah*, 2d chap. 2d verse, "out of the belly of hell, cried I, and thou heardest my voice; 6th verse, "I went down to the bottom of the mountains; the *earth* with her bars was about me *forever;* yet hast thou brought up my life from corruption, O Lord my God."

Reader, "search the scriptures; purge your mind with truth. Discard all prejudice and passion; and attach the same credit to the word of God, which is generally given to the misnamed systems of Calvin, Luther, and Hopkins, and the difficulty will disappear! "*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*"

Psalm lxxxvi. 9.—All *nations* whom thou hast made, shall come and worship before thee, Lord, and shall glorify thy name." John vi. 43, 44, 45. "Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, *murmur not among yourselves.* No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, and they shall *all* be taught of God; every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." And he has declared, "him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out."

To Correspondents.

All Communications forwarded the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD-STREET.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 13, 1820. NO. 4.

The purposes of God are seen in his works, are demonstrable from reason, and are revealed in the Scriptures.

We have seen the harmony and unity of the attributes of Deity, as they are demonstrable from reason, manifested in nature, and revealed in the scriptures. In His being, he is absolute in infinity, and self-existent. In His attributes, almighty in power, unerring in wisdom, and unbounded in goodness. And these, His attributes, are his perfections; they are in unison. The purposes or intentions of any being must, to be consistent with that being, be like him. "The tree is known by its fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit." It therefore follows as a necessary consequence, that nothing that is evil can proceed from God. If we consult our reason, independent of our passions, or our prejudices, good and evil are defined, without any difficulty. If this is admitted as truth, it must follow that prejudice and passion have great influence with mankind, since there is so great a diversity of opinion in the world relative to what is good. This will be acknowledged, if it is considered that many men argue that eternal misery is good, and that some have gone so far in their ideas of this kind of goodness, that they have expressed a willingness to be endlessly miserable, on the principle, that the justice of God required it, and that it would redound to his glory. This is evidently an act of supererogation, of some kind or other, but whether of reason or folly, we leave to the good sense of our readers to determine; and would simply suggest to these extra religious people, the propriety of accepting salvation, and giving it the preference, on the whole, as being likely to redound to their happiness. We have seen, that to be reasonable, is to be just; for that cannot be just which is unreasonable; and it is inevitable, that if never ending misery is for the good of the whole, that the sooner the whole are made endlessly miserable, the sooner goodness will have done its perfect work. Reason also teaches us, that there can be but one kind of goodness; however it may differ in quantity, it can never differ in quality. Therefore, if endless misery is good, endless happiness is proportionably bad; and if endless misery is the will and work of an infinite good being, endless happiness must be the will and work of an infinite bad or wicked being. And as there cannot be two infinite beings, diametrically opposed to each other, there cannot be an infinite evil being, an infinite evil principle, or an endless misery. And the notion of some, that endless misery is good, must be seen in its impious and absurd light. What would be the state of society in the world at large, if a principle of justice, such as is attributed to God, were to influence the conduct of men universally, and produce intentions or purposes in them, of the kind attributed to Deity? We should see the judge pardoning the flagitious criminal and the [illegible] offender, exalting him to honour, and clothing him with every thing that could add to his happiness; and consigning to excruciating torture, and inconceivable anguish, one less criminal, and at the same time, contending for his justice and his power, by acts of injustice and oppression, which would prove him unfit to be intrusted with the one, or to administer the other. The universal goodness of God is seen in nature, and attests the truth of the scriptures, which declare that "he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." And it must be little short of insanity, which could infer evil purposes, from the universal benevolence of that Being, who has declared that "he is *good* to all, and that his *tender mercies* are over *all* his works." If it is unjustifiable, to accuse a man of cruelty of purpose, without more evidence than mere supposition, how preposterous must it be to impute the most abominable and malignant purposes and intentions to a Being, whose every act is mercy, and who even loads his enemies with favours and benefits. It is impossible for a man whose eyes are not completely blinded by the orthodox prejudices which are so prevalent in the world, to regard, with even the smallest attention, the multiplied and abounding provision which God has made for man to sustain his natural body, which is to-day and to-morrow ceases to be, and not see the irresistible evidence, which, "like a cloud of witnesses," surrounds him on every side, proclaiming the goodness of the universal Father; and being compelled, from a flood of testimony, to acknowledge, that he who has made such complete provision for the perishing body, is too good to neglect the immortal, never dying soul. Although every principle of reason, and every faculty of the mind, ought to be employed when the character of the Supreme Being is considered, still there is one principle, which ought to have a particular weight with every man, for without it, it is impossible to form a correct judgment. It is this. There cannot in the universe be but one kind of justice, it is impossible. And it is very essential, that every person who has any inclination to possess consistent views of himself, or others, not only to understand, but believe this to be an immutable truth. From whom did justice proceed? It must be answered from God. Will the Creator alter his justice? Never; for he is unchangable. Is not the Creator, because he is the Creator, the only competent judge of what is just? and are not all men under the most solemn obligation to abide by his declarations, relative to the definition of *justice*, to the exclusion of every other being in the universe? This must be answered in the affirmative. Has God, in his works, or in his word, ever given sufficient reason to man, to be charged by man with inconsistency and injustice? Never. Is there one declaration in his word, that his justice consists in damning with never ending misery the sinner? There is none. Has he not declared that his justice consists in the salvation of the sinner? *He has.* Is it not blaspheming him to deny this, his character given of himself, by himself; to impute to him a principle of action diametrically opposite? It is. Reader, it is not a fellow worm with whom you are at issue, if you deny these deductions; it is your God and Judge. He has declared, that he is a just God and Saviour; and you are bound by reason, nature, revelation, and by every hope of happiness, to believe it.

We understand this paper has been objected to, as containing "too much Universalism." This is a very indefinite term, and however conclusive the proofs may be, which are drawn from the scriptures, relative to the "restitution of all things, which God hath spoken, by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began;" we consider the way in which this is to be effected is the *criterion* to judge of the correctness of every man's sentiments, who professes to believe in the truth of God's declaration, "*by the mouth of all his prophets.*" And if the promulgation of this truth is offensive, and the manner in which the revelation of God declares it shall be effected is offensive likewise, we shall probably offend every opportunity which God in his good providence shall grant us. It is not a fellow worm with whom you are offended, it is your God; for it is his word which is the obnoxious thing, it is not the wisdom of this world, nor the tradition of men. Although the first numbers of this paper, have been principally filled by the Editor, it has not been to the exclusion of matter furnished by correspondents. The columns of this paper are open to all; and however tenacious we may be of our principles, they shall be relinquished, whenever better ones are offered, which shall be founded on greater evidence. This is in one respect universal, in the fullest sense of the term; it is free to all, and to prevent as much as possible any injurious consequences which might otherwise proceed from this *Universalism*, we shall be very careful, when error is published, that the truth shall appear by the side of it, and confidently believe, that it will never suffer by comparison. I would pluck up error by the roots; shake the dust of unbelief, superstition and credulity from every fibre; and expose it naked to the sunshine of truth, until it withers and shrinks, to its primitive nothing. We repeat it, "this paper is free to all;" there is now an opportunity for the zealous of every religious sect, to come forward in support of what they may believe to be truth, and prove it so, if they can; and if they cannot convince others of their errors, it is not impossible but they may, by this method, get rid of some of their own. If these remarks are considered by any as a digression, it is hoped the following will be deemed a sufficient apology.

The subject under discussion is the most important of any, and all that concerns man; and it is necessary, that the reader should be

free from prejudice, or the influence of any passion whatever, other than a sincere desire to learn the truth, and a consequent willingness to examine, with candour and impartiality, every thing that is brought forward as truth. Heaven forbid, that we should wantonly sport with the feelings of any one, or unnecessarily offend any one; but if the truth will offend, we must offend; there neither is, nor can be any other alternative.

If this paper cannot be supported, precisely according to the conditions contained in the Prospectus, and publicly and fearlessly investigate the TRUTH, and combat ERROR, its funeral knell would produce incomparably more pleasure, were it sacrificed a victim on the altar of *charity*, than if it were to be patronised by countless millions, and its eulogium echoed from pole to pole, for its orthodoxical correctness, sectarian purity, and uncharitable views. The subjects discussed in this paper concern all men universally; and all men without exception, have a just right to be heard. In discussing the important subject, of the purposes of God relative to man, it is confidently hoped, that those who may differ in their views from us, will come forward boldly in defence of what they believe to be the truth; for salvation is a prize worth contending for, and the loss of it would be an evil, dreadful beyond conception. And if the promulgation of what we believe to be *the truth*, can have even the smallest possible tendency to produce so tremendous a catastrophe, how imperious is the duty of all who believe this, to rouze every energy they possess, and without suffering the delay of a moment, snatch from the horrible precipice, their erring deluded friends. An assembly of divines convened at Westminster, have asserted, that "*the chief end of man is to glorify God, and enjoy him forever.*" And the apostle and servant of Christ has declared, "that *all things* were made *by him* and *for him.*" The first is proved to be true, by the last; therefore, we believe them both; and dissent from the current opinion, that a part of mankind are a seed sown by the devil, and consequently his offspring, and if not absolutely made by him, at least for him; and that he will have them for ever, in the most extensive sense of the terms. Although we do not court controversy, yet we call upon the believers in this hypothesis to come forward and prove it to be truth; and whether they come, or not, we pledge ourselves to prove it false; which will be done in our quotations from the scriptures relative to the purposes of God, as it regards man, which will commence with our 5th Number.

(To be continued.)

COMMUNICATIONS.

On the testimony of prophecy in regard to the Divine Person and character of Jesus Christ.

(Continued.)

Many other passages from the psalms might, if needful, be adduced, all confirming the same idea, that they relate, in their supreme sense, to the great Saviour Jesus Christ, and are the everlasting records of his combats with, and victories over, the powers of darkness, and of his double states of humiliation and glorification, until his human nature, or manhood, became admissive of, and incorporated with, the whole of the Divine nature, or Godhead, called the Father, so as to make one, agreeable to that declaration of the apostle, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. (Col. ii. 9.)

But I hasten to call your attention to the predictions and declarations of the other prophetic writers of the Old Testament, from which will appear, if there be any force or meaning in language, that Jesus Christ is not only a being infinitely superior to what the Unitarians or Socinians make him, but that he is, in very deed and truth, the Most High God, dwelling in, and one with, the humanity which he assumed and glorified here on earth. By glorifying, I mean making divine, (See John xiii. 31 to 33.)

I shall begin with the prophet Isaiah, who thus testifies, "Therefore the Lord (JEHOVAH) himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel," (God with us:) cvii. 14.) And again, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end." (ix. 6, 7,) Who now, let me ask, is the extraordinary Person announced in the above prophetic words? Can it be said, with any propriety, of a mere man, that he is Immanuel, or God with us, and that his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, and that of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end? We are compelled therefore to assert, either that the words of God have no meaning, or that the child and son above spoken of, have reference to the humanity of Jesus Christ, which, by virtue of its divine conception, was called Immanuel or God with us; (see Matt. i. 22, 23.) and by virtue of its being finally glorified or made Divine, was called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, of the increase of whose government and peace there would be no end, that is to say, it would be eternal.

It may possibly be objected, by the Unitarian or Socinian, that the son, in the above passage, is said to be given, and that therefore the Being who gave him, must not only be distinct from him, but superior to him; consequently, that Jesus Christ, who is here meant by the Son, is both distinct from, and inferior to, the Father, by whom he was given. In reply to this objection it is to be recollected, that when the Father is said to give his Son, or to send him into the world, the same thing is meant as the Son's going forth or proceeding, agreeable to those words of Jesus Christ, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." (John xvi. 28.) It is to be recollected also, that Jesus Christ, as to his human nature or humanity, was at first inferior to his Father, agreeable to his own declaration, "The Father is greater than I." (John xiv. 28.) But in proportion as his humanity was glorified, or made divine, by being fully united with the Father, he was then enabled to say, I and the Father are one; he that seeth me, seeth the Father; believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me. (John x. 3. chap. xiv. 9, 10, 11.)

I pass over the 11th and 12th chapters of this prophet, which yet contain the strongest testimonies of the divine nature and character of the predicted Redeemer of mankind, confirmed by the wonderful works, which none but a God could perform, and which compelled the prophet to exclaim, in the rapture of devout adoration, "Behold God is my salvation; I will trust and not be afraid; for the Lord JEHOVAH is my strength and my song; He also is become my salvation. Sing unto the Lord, for he hath done wonderful things; this is known in all the earth." (Chap. xii. 2, 5.) Neither shall I dwell particularly on the 25th and 26th chapters, which yet record the more than mortal acts of that Great Saviour, who was to swallow up death in victory, so that it should be said in that day, "Lo! this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord, (JEHOVAH,) we have waited for him; we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation. Trust ye in the Lord for ever, for in the Lord JEHOVAH is everlasting strength." (xxv. 8, 9. xxvi. 4.) Let me, however, earnestly recommend to you to give the above chapters a serious perusal, and also the 35th, wherein the blessings of the advent of the Redeemer are further recorded, and then say, whether those blessings do not manifest, as the prophet expresseth it, "the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God." (Chap. xxxv. 2.)

Quitting then these chapters, lest I should appear tedious, permit me to call your most awakened attention to the 40th chapter, which proves the point in question beyond the possibility of a doubt. It begins with this affecting address, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God;" but why are the people to be comforted? We are told in the following verse, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, (JEHOVAH,) make straight in the desert a highway for our God." (Verse 3.) Now we know, from the authority of the Gospel, that the voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, has reference to John the Baptist, (see Mat. iii. 1, 2, 3. John i. 23.) of whom it is further written in the prophet Malachi, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare my way before me." (Chap. iii. 1. Mark 1. 2.) But John the Baptist, we know from his own testimony, was the forerunner, or messenger, to announce the coming of Jesus Christ, and prepare the way of that Great Saviour. (See John i. 19 to 35.) Can any inference then be more plain or incontrovertible, than that Jesus Christ is JEHOVAH, or the Lord? For in the prophet Isaiah it is said of this messenger, that he was to prepare the way of JEHOVAH, and to make straight in the desert a highway for our God; and it is said by JEHOVAH himself, in the prophet Malachi, "Behold, I will send my messenger, which shall prepare my way before me." If then there be any meaning in language, JEHOVAH and Jesus are here manifestly identified as the same Being, since John the Baptist is said, by the prophets, to prepare the way of JEHOVAH, and by the evangelists, to prepare the way of Jesus. It is further to be observed, concerning John the Baptist, that Jesus Christ bears witness of him, that "among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist." (Matt. xi. 11. Luke vii. 28.) Yet this same John the Baptist bears witness of Jesus Christ in these words, "This is he of whom I said, after me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for he was before me." (John i. 30.) Jesus

Christ, therefore, as being greater than John the Baptist, must, of course, be greater than any that are born of woman, consequently he must be more than a mere man.

But I have not yet done with this extraordinary chapter, for in the 5th verse we find it written, "The glory of JEHOVAH shall be revealed;" and in the 9th and 10th verses, "Say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God; behold, the Lord God will come with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd." Now I would ask any reasonable man, whether these words do not contain a positive declaration that Jesus Christ is no other than the Most High God? For Jesus Christ styles himself the Good Shepherd, and his disciples his sheep; (John x. 11, 14.) and yet in the above words it is said of the Lord God, that he shall come, and feed his flock like a shepherd. But when did this Lord God come to feed his flock like a shepherd, except in the person of Jesus Christ? It is plain, then, that Jesus Christ is here again identified to be the same being with the Lord God, since he himself assumes the divine office and character which are assigned by the prophet to the Lord God; besides, properly speaking, there can be but one good shepherd of the sheep, or people of God, in like manner as there can be but one bridegroom and one husband of that people. If then the Lord God be that good shepherd, and if Jesus Christ also be the same, it is evident, to a demonstration, that the Lord God and Jesus Christ are identically one and the same Divine Being.

I might now call your attention to several other chapters in this truly evangelical prophet, equally demonstrative, with the foregoing, of the divinity of the great Saviour, particularly to the 42d, where mention is made of his divine acts; and to the 53d and 63d, where the humiliations and sufferings are so affectingly described, which he endured as to his human nature, before it was glorified or made divine; and where, likewise, his combats against the powers of darkness, and his victories over them, are so faithfully and minutely depicted. But leaving these chapters to your own serious perusal and reflection, I shall beg leave, before we quit the testimony of this prophet, to suggest a consideration which, I must confess, carries with it, to my own mind, the greatest force of evidence on the subject of our present discussion. The consideration is this, that JEHOVAH is so frequently represented by this prophet as calling himself the Saviour and Redeemer of his people, and declaring positively, that there is no other. Thus it is written, "Am not I JEHOVAH, and there is none besides me; a just God and a Saviour, there is none besides me." (Chap. xlv. 21, 22.) Again, "I, even I, am JEHOVAH, and there is no Saviour besides me." (xliii. 11.) Again, "As for our Redeemer, JEHOVAH of hosts is his name." (xlvii. 4.) Again, "Thus saith JEHOVAH thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, I am JEHOVAH thy God." (xlviii. 17.) Again, "And all flesh shall know that I JEHOVAH am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty one of Jacob." (xlix. 26. chap. lx. 16.) Again, "With everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith JEHOVAH thy Redeemer." (liv. 8.) Again, "Thou JEHOVAH, art our Father, our Redeemer, Thy name is from everlasting." (lxiii. 16.) And, as this redeeming and saving JEHOVAH was more than ordinarily anxious to prevent all mistake and misapprehension on this important point, he is made to say, "My glory will I not give to another;" (xlii. 8.) by which declaration nothing else can possibly be meant, than that he would not give to another the glory of being a Saviour and Redeemer. Now we know that Jesus Christ is perpetually called, in the New Testament, a Saviour and Redeemer; (see Luke ii. 11. John iv. 42. Acts v. 31. xiii. 23. Col. iii. 13. Rev. v. 9.) and to him also is ascribed the glory and honour of being a Saviour and Redeemer, for thus it is written in the Revelations, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins by his own blood, to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." (Chap. i. 5, 6.) And again, "Blessing and honour, glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, for ever and ever." (Chap. v. 13.) Jesus Christ also himself teaches, that "all men should honour the Son as they honour the Father." (John v. 23.) To Jesus Christ then is given the glory, which JEHOVAH declared he would not give to another. What then is the fair and just conclusion, but that Jesus Christ is not another; consequently that he is the same with JEHOVAH?

Quitting now the prophet Isaiah, not because I have exhausted his testimony, (for I have scarcely adduced a thousandth part of it,) but lest I should appear too prolix, and encroach too much on your time and patience, I shall bespeak your attention to what is to be found in the other prophets, in confirmation of the above important doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ. In pursuing this part of my subject, it will be sufficient to show, that the other prophets are in perfect agreement with the prophet Isaiah concerning the divine person, character, and office of the Great Saviour, testifying, in the most explicit terms, that, that Saviour was no other than JEHOVAH God, the Maker and Governor of the world. For hear now the language of the prophet Jeremiah on this most interesting point, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, (JEHOVAH,) that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord (JEHOVAH) our righteousness." (Chap. xxiii. 5, 6. Chap. xxxiii. 15, 16.) In the prophet Ezekiel, too, the advent of the Great Saviour is called the day of JEHOVAH. (xxx. 2, 3.) So likewise it is written in Joel, "Alas! the day of JEHOVAH is nigh." (Chap. i. 15.) And again, "The day of JEHOVAH cometh; great is the day of JEHOVAH, and very terrible; the sun shall be turned to darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of JEHOVAH cometh." (Chap. ii. 1, 2, 11, 31.) To the same effect we read in Obadiah, "The day of JEHOVAH is near upon all the heathen." (Verse 15.) And in Amos, "Wo unto you that desire the day of JEHOVAH; the day of JEHOVAH is darkness and not light; shall not the day of JEHOVAH be darkness and not light?" (v. 17, 18, 20.) Also in Zephaniah, "The day of JEHOVAH is nigh; the great day of JEHOVAH is nigh." (i. 7, 14.) But the prophet Micah is still more express, for he writes thus, "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity." (Chap. v. 2.) And that these words have reference to Jesus Christ, is plain, from the testimony of the evangelist Matthew, (chap. ii. 5, 6.) Zechariah also is equally pointed with Micah on the same subject, where he writes, "Behold, the day of JEHOVAH is coming; and his feet shall stand in that day on the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east; and JEHOVAH shall be King over all the earth; in that day shall there be one JEHOVAH, and his name one." (Chap. xiv. 1, 4, 9.) To the same purpose it is written in Malachi, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and JEHOVAH, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple; but who may abide the day of his coming?" &c. Chap. iii. 1, 2.) And again, "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the great and terrible day of JEHOVAH cometh." (Chap. ix. 5.)

And what now, let me ask, do you think of this prophetic testimony, or to whom do you conceive it is properly applicable? The righteous Branch raised up unto David, as mentioned by Jeremiah, has been interpreted by all pious writers in past ages, as pointing at Jesus Christ. Yet the prophet declares, concerning this Righteous Branch, "This is his name whereby he shall be called JEHOVAH our righteousness." The coming, too, of Jesus Christ into the world, is called repeatedly, and by several of the prophets, the day of JEHOVAH. But is it at all probable, or conceivable, that the appearing of a mere man in the world, would have been thus designated, and distinguished by so many singular marks and characters as are annexed to that day, in the language of the prophets? Besides, the prophet Micah expressly, declares that out of Bethlehem Ephratah should come he that is to be ruler in Israel, (which prophecy is interpreted by the evangelist, as having reference to Jesus Christ,) and yet it is asserted of this ruler, that his goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity. How then can this ruler be a mere man, or how can he be less than the Great and Holy God! The prophets Zechariah and Malachi also are equally express, when the first says, "The feet of JEHOVAH shall stand in that day on the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem," and when the second says, that "JEHOVAH shall suddenly come to his temple." But at what time, or by whom, have these prophecies been accomplished, except by Jesus Christ when he appeared in the flesh? We are compelled therefore to conclude, on the authority of each of these prophets, that JEHOVAH and Jesus are synonymous, since in the person of the latter were fulfilled the extraordinary circumstances which the prophets foresaw and foretold concerning the former.

You see then, my dear Sir, how fully and firmly the Divinity of the Great Redeemer is established, both in the Psalms and in the prophets, and, consequently, how totally groundless is the Unitarian or Socinian doctrine, when brought to the test of that high authority, and examined by the bright light of the Divine Truth. But you have as yet seen only, as it were, the twilight of the Saviour's glory; for to behold its meridian splendour, it will be necessary to view it in its full manifestation and

accomplishment, when prediction was verified, and the visions of the prophets were all realized in the person of Jesus Christ, and at the time of his appearing here on earth. This was, in deed and in truth, the day of JEHOVAH, and on this occasion it might, with the utmost propriety, be said, in the language of Malachi, "JEHOVAH, whom ye seek, is come to his temple;" and in the language of Isaiah, "Moreover, the light of the moon is become as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun is seven-fold, as the light of seven days." (Chap. xxx. 26.) But I shall reserve the consideration of these grand events to be the subject of another Letter.

(To be continued.)

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Your observation respecting the expression "both to preserve the angels in heaven, and to effect the salvation of men upon earth," induces me to explain my ideas on this most serious subject. I beg leave to observe there are no angels who were not once men upon earth, and such is the regularity of Divine order, (from which he never departs) that the salvation of men, as well as the happiness and enjoyment of angels in heaven, were infested by evil spirits, their numbers increasing to such a degree, that the first would have been completely ruined, and the latter would have been infested to a great degree. This was foreseen by the Divine Providence of the Lord, and a promise was made that the seed of the offending female should *bruise*, *destroy*, and in a great *degree stop* the progress of evil (meaning the serpent's head)—This was done by the Divinity clothing itself in a human form, descending upon this earth, suffering those evil spirits to exercise their power, and being Omnipotent, was able, not only to overcome in times of severe temptations, but to *bind*, *confine* and *seal up* those hells, into which they were cast, and that they should never be suffered to exercise this evil power again,—and this was completed by his final existence on this earth, or his crucifixion on the cross, after which He descended into hell to complete the great work of redeeming both angels and men, and completing the above promise, made after Adam had sinned, and broken the command of this very same Lord, who told the Jews, Before Abraham was I Am. If in ancient time angels became devils, and one arch fiend became the head and ruler of the infernal regions, let me ask what power had the Lord over these before he came upon earth? Being the ruler and governor of all things, both spiritual and natural, by the order and permission of a Divine Providence, he causes all things to work together for good to them that love him, and this Divine Providence was the Cherubim that guarded and defended the Tree of Life; or the internal affections of man from destroying the soul, the essential quality of the human race, and the real and true church of God preserved by his Divine Providence on this earth, and which both shall and will exist, whereby a spiritual communication may for ever be open between the two worlds, on purpose to lead all to heaven who live a good life and worship him as the only true and living God.—

It is our opinion that truth is simple, plain and conclusive; error, pregnant with doubts and uncertainty; we think our correspondent's opinions are proof of the correctness of the above remark. This doctrine, that the "*Cherubim's are the providence of God*, is in our opinion liable at least to one very solid objection. In Ezekiel's prophecy, chap. x. 19th and 20th verses, we read, "and the *Cherubims* lifted up their wings and mounted up from the earth in my sight; when they went out, the wheels also were beside them, and every one stood at the door of the east gate of the Lord's house; and the glory of the God of Israel was over them above. This is the *living creature* that I saw under the God of Israel by the river of Chebar, and I knew that they were the *Cherubims*." Did the prophet speak of the providence of God, or of angels, the ministers and messengers of God, who are employed as instruments by God, to effect such purposes, as he, in his divine *providence* or *government*, sees is proper; and would it not be an outrage upon reason, to describe the providence of God, as *living creatures* with wings, and flying? If Cherubims are living creatures, or angels, I repeat the question, who were their prototypes? It must be remembered, that the cherubims first alluded to could not have been men upon earth, for they were cherubims before the birth of one of the race of Adam.

Note. The reader is referred to our 2d number, seventh page.

"As the tree falleth, so it lieth; and as death leaves us, judgment will find us."

These words are often quoted as scripture, and are by many believed to be the declaration of God. It is a fact, however, that they are not to be found in the Bible. In Ecclesiastes, xi. chap. 1st to the 4th verses inclusive, we read, "Cast thy bread upon the waters; for thou shalt find it after many days. Give a portion to seven, and also to eight, for thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth. If the clouds be full of rain, they empty themselves upon the earth; and if the tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be. He that observeth the wind shall not sow; and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap." This has been considered as an exhortation to, or "directions for charity;" and what could induce any person, to pervert it in the strange and unjustifiable manner above mentioned, is more than we can determine. How that, which on the very face of it is an exhortation to charity, should be construed to the destruction of charity itself, is certainly mysterious indeed. Paul declares, that "neither *life*, nor *death*, nor things *present*, nor things *to come*, nor any other *creature*, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." And we believe the falling of a tree, whether it shall fall toward the north, or south, east, or west, can have no relation to, or effect in, the future state of man, in any shape whatever. "Do ye look on things after the outward appearance; *if any man* trust to *himself* that *he is Christ's*, let him of himself *think this again*, that as *he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's*." 2d Corinthians, x. chap. 7th verse.

Man's last, great change.

It is very common to hear men talk about their last great change, and to define it to be, the separation of the soul from the body; and consequently, to take place at death. To believe this, is to be orthodox; to doubt it, is to doubt the wisdom of men, and to be blamed by them for heresy. This is one, among many proofs, that it is very unpopular at this day, to give the Bible a decided preference to all other books. Paul, in his epistle to the Corinthians, xv. chap. 51st to 54th verses, preaches a doctrine, which we think is plain, simple and conclusive. "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible *must* put on incorruption, and this mortal *must* put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." Will the trump ever sound? And if it shall sound, and "all be changed," will not that be the last, and the greatest change? If Calvin and Hopkins speak the truth, hear them; but if Paul speaks truth, hear him. It is worthy of remark, that Paul speaks in the most positive manner, of a thing which *must* take place. He does not say this may, or can, or I have a hope that it will happen; but "The trump shall sound, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." If this is not the great, and last change; and a change after death, it is not in the power of words to express it.

To a Correspondent.

We recently received a communication from a *friend*, with a signature, whether true or fictitious, is to us immaterial; and whether written with a view to instruct, or offend, is immaterial likewise, especially so far as our feelings are in question. The communication is inadmissible, if not from allusion to persons in particular, at least from its irrelevancy to the subjects proper to be discussed in this paper. If the writer considers the ground of reasoning we have adopted as untenable, his rebukes will be received with pleasure, provided they are couched in proper language. But if his motive is simply to ridicule, he is informed, that we are as invulnerable to the folly of the scorner, as we are "easy to be entreated of," and convinced, by the wisdom of the prudent."

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to become subscribers to this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can be furnished with the numbers, from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD-STREET.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1820. NO. 5.

The Purposes of God are revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(Continued.)

"*God is Love.*" And that his purposes are love, and have for their object the happiness of "*his offspring*"—the family of man, the Scriptures abundantly testify. In Genesis, 1st chap. 27th and 28th verses, we read, "So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God BLESSED *them.*" This is the first account of man, and of God's purpose relative to him, which is revealed in the Scriptures. Hath God said it, and shall he not do it? The blessing of God is pronounced upon man, and we have the declaration of God by his prophet, "that his word shall not return unto him void, but shall accomplish that which I please, and shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it. For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace." At the fall, notwithstanding the transgression of man, God not only refrains from cursing him, but pronounces a new blessing, by declaring to Adam and Eve, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head; which seed, the apostle Paul declares, is Christ; who was manifested, that "he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Hebrews, 2d chap. 14th verse. The promise of blessing is renewed to Abraham in the most particular and emphatic manner, in Genesis, 22d chap. 16th, 17th, and 18th verses. "And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, *By myself have* I SWORN, SAITH THE LORD; for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only *son:* that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is on the seashore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice." In the 13th chap. 16th verse. "And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered." In the 28th chapter of Genesis, 14th verse, the promise is renewed to Jacob. "And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south; and in thee, and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed." In the 6th chap. of Numbers, 23d verse to the close of the chapter, God commands Moses to bless the children of Israel, and to charge Aaron and his sons to put his name upon the children of Israel, and declares, "I will bless them." In the book of the Acts of the Apostles, 3d chap. 25th and 26th verses, the Apostle Peter quotes the blessing pronounced upon Abraham, and tells the Jews "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, *And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.* Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away *every one of you from his iniquities.*" Paul in his epistle to the Galatians 3d chap. 16th verse, testifies to the same in the following, "Now to Abraham and to his *seed* were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of *one*, And to thy *seed*, *which is Christ.*"

It is impossible for any thing to be plainer than this truth, that all mankind are the blessed of the Lord. When Balak, king of the Moabites, sent for Balaam the prophet to curse the Israelites, "*God said unto Balaam, thou shalt not curse the people, for they are blessed.* How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed? Or how shall I defy whom God hath not defied?" Hath God cursed no man? I answer, NO, NOT ONE. God has forbid cursing, it is a violation of his law, which declares, "he that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death." In Jeremiah, 11th chapter, 3d verse, we read, "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, cursed be the man that obeyeth not the word of this covenant." Galatians, 3d chapter, 10th to 13th verse. "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, cursed is every one that continueth not in *all things* which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that *no man is justified by the law* in the sight of God is evident; for, the just shall live by faith, and the law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them, shall live in them. Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." With these explicit testimonies witnessing the goodness of God, who took upon him our nature, and endured the curse of a broken law in the stead of man, whom he had blessed; who shall presume to curse mankind, or any part of them? much less to accuse the Divine God of love of an intention to curse those whom he had blessed; and who sent his only begotten Son to redeem them by his blood, and sanctify them by his truth, and wash them clean from all their iniquities, that they might be made partakers of his holiness. The law which was delivered from Mount Sinai, is in a prominent manner explanatory of the purposes of God, the Lawgiver. In discussing this part of our subject, we confidently hope that those, to whom our views may be new, will examine their Bibles before they condemn; and whatever may be their decision, we ask no other favour, but the privilege of being tried by the Scriptures, and not arraigned before the tribunal of Calvin, Hopkins, or any other human authority. There are three important considerations. First, what was intended by the Lawgiver, in giving the law? Second, will this purpose or intention be effected, or accomplished? Third, when will this purpose be effected?

First, what was intended by the Lawgiver in giving the law? We answer, first, that the salvation, or the damnation of mankind, or any part of them, according to the common acceptation of the terms, was not intended; for the law promises nothing but temporal benefits; and threatens nothing but temporal punishment. For proof of this, we refer the reader to the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, and request him to read the whole of the chapter with the utmost attention. The prophet declares, that "in keeping the law there is great reward;" not *for* keeping it. And we would suggest to those who expect reward for keeping the law, that they must keep it perfectly to be entitled to the value of one cent as a reward, and even on condition of rendering perfect obedience to all its requisitions, there is nothing promised them but temporal benefits; and that they will, in that case, be paid every day for their perfect work. This declaration is made unhesitatingly, because it is truth; and no evil consequences can flow from it; for as no man except Christ, who was God and man, ever kept the law, we presume no advantage can be taken from our declarations. See Romans, 4th chap. 13th, 14th, 15th verses, "for the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith, for if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect. Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression." 3d chap. 20th verse, "Therefore by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Hebrews, 7th chap. 18th and 19th verses, "For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. *For the law made nothing perfect,* but the bringing in of a better hope, by the which, we draw nigh unto God." 8th chap. 7th verse. "For if the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Galatians, 2d chap. 21st verse. "I do not frustrate the grace of God; *for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.*" 3d chap. 18th verse. "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise." 19th verse. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come; to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." 21st verse. "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." Romans, 5th

chap. 20th and 21st verses. "Moreover, the law entered that the offence might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin has reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." We think the above quotations are more than sufficient to convince any man, who receives the Scriptures as truth, that salvation, or eternal life, cannot come by the law, nor never was intended to come by the law. Our next statement is, that damnation, as it is generally understood, was never intended by the Lawgiver, who is God. For proof, See Galatians, 3d chap. 15th, 16th, 17th verses." Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy *seed*, which is *Christ*." And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of *God in Christ*, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Now it is as clear as words can make it, that the law which was 430 years after the promise, cannot damn with never-ending misery any man who is blessed by that promise; and the promise is, that in Christ, the seed of Abraham, "all the families, kindreds and nations of the earth shall be blessed." Hebrews, 6th chap. 13th to 19th verses inclusive, proves this in language strong as human reason can conceive." For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee, and so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater; and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath, that by two immutable things, wherein it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us; which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil." If the question is again asked, wherefore then serveth the law?" If the law will not save, nor destroy, of what use was it? we answer in the words of Paul; "the law was added because of transgression, until the seed, Christ, should come, to whom the promise was made. And it was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. For the law made nothing perfect." Now the *law*, as a schoolmaster, is simply a *teacher*, and the thing *taught* is *Christ*. It is in this emphatic sense, that Paul considered it, and declared, "I was alive without the law," or *schoolmaster*, or *teacher*, "but when the *commandment*," or *teacher*, "came, sin revived and I died." Paul was taught, that "by the law, no flesh should be justified;" and all his hopes of *salvation* by the *law died*. How many are there at this day, who preach *Moses*, instead of *Christ*? and declare, that there is no salvation but by our own works, under, or in conformity with, the law; and this, openly and pertinaciously persisted in to the utter disregard of, and in direct opposition to, the positive declaration of God, by his Prophets and Apostles. Is this going "*to the law, and the testimony?*" or is it not going to the *law* and perverting the *law*; and avoiding the *testimony*, and denying the *testimony?* It is impressively upon some, and expressly to all, declared in the revelation of *Jehovah*, that "the testimony of Christ is the spirit of prophecy;" and that "Christ is God, the same to-day, yesterday, and for ever!" and that the *heavens* have received Him, "*until the* times of restitution of all things, which GOD hath spoken by the mouth of *all his holy* prophets since the world began." *This is the testimony of Christ;* communicated to man by his *Spirit of prophecy, the Holy Ghost;* and let all those who talk LOUDLY about the unpardonable sin, ask themselves if they do not *blaspheme against the Holy Ghost*, give him the *lie direct*, and carry their enmity to Christ to that length, that they even "smite with the fist of wickedness" those, who dare believe this *testimony*, and publicly confess its truth.—"Brethren, such things ought not so to be. It is time to awake, thou that *sleepest;* let the time past suffice us to have done evil awake to righteousness and sin not."

"Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and *turn* to the Lord, and he will have mercy on him; and to *our God*, for *He* will *abundantly* pardon. For *my thoughts* are not *your thoughts*, nor *my ways your ways*, saith the Lord; for as the heavens are above the earth, so are *my ways above your ways*, and *my thoughts above your thoughts*." What are the thoughts and ways of men? Do they not think that God, enraged with infinite and almighty FRENZY, will snatch the forked thunderbolt, glowing with the fury of eternal wrath, and smite with never-ending misery, and tremendous vengeance the sinner? And does *man* exert his *impotent* malice against his enemy? blast him with all the destruction he can devise, and atone for the impotence of his power, by the cruelty of his wishes? and shall God do thus? NO! NEVER! HEAR, O HEAVENS, and *give ear*, O EARTH; "*All the* ENDS *of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. For the kingdom is the Lord's, and He is the governor among the nations*," and He will have mercy on them, for He is *our* "God, and abundantly pardons."—Therefore, "Praise the Lord, all ye nations, praise Him, all ye people; for his *merciful kindness is great towards US, and the truth of the Lord endureth for ever. Praise the Lord, for HE is good; because his mercy endureth for ever! Praise ye the Lord.*"

(To be continued.)

COMMUNICATION.

(Continued.)

On the accomplishment of prophecy in the person of Jesus Christ, proving fully his divine Office and Character.

In my letter you would discover the day-dawn of that bright and glorious morning, on which the "Sun of Righteousness was to arise on a benighted and disordered world, with healing in his wings." (See Mal. iv. 2.) I wish now to call your attention to the Sun himself, and to some of the more remarkable circumstances attending his rising, and also his progress to his meridian splendour, until he became fixed in the firmament of heaven, to give eternal life; and light, and benediction, to all the families of beings both in heaven above, and in the earth beneath. By the sun, I would here be understood to mean, as the prophet meant, the great Saviour, whose history is recorded in the pages of the New Testament; from which I hope to make it appear, that he was, in very deed and truth, that identical divine person whom the prophets foresaw and predicted, and whom they styled, as you have seen, Immanuel, or God with us, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father; also, Jehovah our righteousness.

The first memorable circumstance which arrests our notice respecting this great Saviour, is that of his miraculous conception, which differs essentially from that of other men, for so it is written in the evangelist Matthew, "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise; when as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph, her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." (Matt. i. 18, 19, 20.) To the same purpose it is written in the evangelist Luke, "The angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a virgin espoused to a man, whose name was Joseph, and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favour with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."* (Luke i. 16 to 26.) In the same strain of mysterious and divine language, we find it written in the evangelist John; "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." (John i. 1, 3, 14.)

Now is it possible for any reader of the above passages not to see, that the Being to

---

* It may here be proper to remark, that the idea of a Son of God born from eternity, appears to have no just ground either in Scripture or in reason. For in the Sacred Scriptures we never read of a Son of God, until he was born of a Virgin Mother; and reason teaches the utter absurdity of supposing that what is begotten and born can be eternal. Besides, it is said in the first chapter of the evangelist John, that the Word was made flesh, (verse 14.) and it is written of this word, that it was with God, and the Word was God, (verse 1.) whence the conclusion is plain, that Jehovah God, as the Word, took upon him human nature, and not as Son of God, born from eternity.

whom they refer, must be of a nature and character far above that of a mere man, and not inferior to God? For he is said to be conceived by the Holy Ghost, and by the power of the Highest. He is also described as the Word made flesh, of which Word it is written, that it was with God, and God was the Word, and that all things were made by him; and he is further called the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. And to what mere man can such expressions, with any propriety, or indeed with any meaning, be applied? The just conclusion then is, that Jesus Christ, to whom the words are applied in the Sacred History, was more than a mere man, and being conceived by the power of the Highest, or being the eternal word made flesh, could be nothing less than God.

I am well aware that the Unitarians, or Socinians, sensible of the force and meaning of the above testimony, endeavour to evade it, by insisting that the chapters, in which it is contained, are interpolations, and form no part of the original Gospels. But on this occasion they only prove, how far prejudice is wont to bias the understanding, and how little disposed men are to believe what they cannot reconcile with their preconceived opinions. For how else could the authorities of Stephens, Walton, Mills, Schleusner, Birch, Wetstein, Bengelius, Michaelis, Griesbach, Marsh, &c. all of them men of the most profound learning, with a hundred others, who include the above chapters in the sacred code, have been overlooked and contradicted?

From the Divine conception of the Great Redeemer, I might now call your attention to some remarkable circumstances attending His birth, as that it was announced by an angel to the shepherds, who were keeping watch over their flock by night; and how, on this occasion, "there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." Luke ii. 8th to 19th. I might also remind you of the miraculous star which appeared, on the same occasion, to the wise men of the east, to conduct them to the birth-place of the infant Jesus, and how, "when they saw the young child, with Mary his mother, they fell down and worshipped Him." (Mat. ii. 1 to 13.) In like manner I might dwell upon the baptism of the Great Saviour, showing how, in the former case, "the heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon Him, and lo! a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." (Matt. iii. 13 to 17.) And how, in the latter case, viz. his temptations, Jesus said to the tempter, "It is written, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," and how, after the temptation, "Angels came and ministered unto him." (Matt. iv. 1 to 12.) All these extraordinary facts, I say, might be adverted to, as establishing full and decided proofs that the Blessed Jesus was something more than mere man, since otherwise, why should He be worshipped by the wise men? or why should the heavens be opened at His baptism, and the Spirit of God descend like a dove, and light upon him? &c. Why, also, at His temptation, should He say to the devil, It is written, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God? For in this quotation, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," Jesus Christ manifestly adverts to what is written in the book of Deuteronomy, chap. vi. 16. But in that book it is thus expressed, "Thou shalt not tempt Jehovah thy God." It is evident then, that Jesus Christ, for Jehovah, substitutes the term Lord, as also in Mark xii. 29. and Luke x. 27. which is a plain proof, that He considered the two terms Jehovah and Lord, as synonimous. But who shall we say is the Lord, or what does this name involve? Let Jesus Christ himself answer this question, where He says to his disciples, "ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am." (John xiii. 13.) Jesus Christ then, as being the Lord, must, by his own interpretation, be Jehovah, and accordingly our translators of the Old Testament constantly substitute the term Lord for Jehovah.

But leaving these points to be the subjects of your own serious consideration, I shall now hasten to other proofs, even more decisive, if possible, than these, from which, I trust, it will appear plain as the noonday sun, that Jesus Christ was no other than the Most High God, united, indeed at first, with an infirm humanity, which he derived from the mother, to the intent that He might manifest himself here below; but united successively afterward to a glorified or Divine Humanity, in which He now reigns as the Supreme God of heaven and earth, and from and by which, he rules and governs all things, both in heaven and earth.

Before we proceed, however, let me remark concerning the above infirm humanity derived from the mother, that it will account for all those passages in the evangelical history, in which we find, that the Blessed Jesus was tempted; that He prayed to the Father; that He declared he came to do the will of the Father; that he called himself inferior to the Father; also, that He suffered, died, and was buried. For, as God, it was impossible that He should either suffer, die, or be buried. As God, too, it was impossible that he should be tempted, or pray to another, or say that He came to do the will of another, or call himself inferior to another. Whilst therefore Jesus was in this infirm humanity, He was subject to all the infirmities of human nature, and declares himself to be so; but in the degree in which He put off this infirm humanity, and put on a Divine humanity, in the same degree He rose superior to all the weakness of a mere man, and assumed to himself a Divine character, power, prerogative, and operation. You are to understand, therefore, that in Jesus Christ there was a two-fold nature, the one human, the other Divine; the one external, the other internal; just as in every individual man we find there are two men, the outer man and the inner man; or in other words, the natural man and the spiritual. And as it is the continual intention of God to unite in man the outer and inner man, the natural and spiritual man, that so the inner and spiritual may rule and bless the outer and natural; in like manner, it was the continual will and purpose of Jesus Christ, with a view to the salvation of mankind, to unite in himself the Divinity and humanity, the Internal and External; that so both together might become One Lord God, differing from the former Lord God, or the God before the incarnation, in this respect, that he was now made a visible, a near, a known, and an approachable God; whereas before, He was invisible, distant, unknown, and unapproachable. For such had been the terrible effects of sin upon the human race, that all the knowledge of the Great Eternal God was nearly lost, insomuch that he was thought to be both distant, unapproachable, and irreconcileable. And so, in all probability, he would ever have continued to be thought, had not he, in his adorable mercy, condescended to assume and glorify the humanity, and thus to make himself again visible, near, known, approachable, reconcileable, to his lost creatures.

Keeping now these observations in view, which, by the bye, seem to have been altogether overlooked by the Unitarians or Socinians, allow me to proceed to the consideration of those other decisive proofs of the Divinity of the Great Saviour, to which I before adverted, and which may be referred to these two distinct classes.

First, The proofs derived from his works

Secondly, Those derived from his words.

I shall begin with the proofs derived from his works; all of which announce a power and authority more than human, and nothing less than Divine. For, behold! at his omnipotent word, devils tremble and are cast out, (Matt. vii. 28 to 34. Mark v. 2 to 15. Luke viii. 26 to 36.) "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them." (Matt. xi. 5.) By his blessing also, a few loaves and fishes are increased and multiplied to such an amazing degree, as to satisfy the craving hunger of many thousands of his fainting followers. (Matt. xiv. 26 to 22. chap. xv. 32 to 39.) The winds and the waves, too, obey His mighty voice, and are still. (Matt viii. 25 to 28.) Even the living creatures in the sea are not insensible to his command, for when the necessity of the case required it, we find a fish presenting a piece of money. (Matt. xvii. 24 to 27.) And on another occasion, the net, which the disciples had cast into the sea, was so full, that they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes. (John xxi. 6.) But this was not all, for to prove that he had power over the world of mind, as well as that of matter, he granted forgiveness of sins to the humble and the penitent, (Matt. ix, 5, 6. Mark ii. 9, 10. Luke v. 23, 24.) a favour which none could grant but God alone, as it is asked, on the occasion, Who can forgive sins but God only? (Mark ii. 7.)

(To be continued.)

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS.

The Apostle Paul in his epistle to the Romans, 5th chap. 15 verse, declares that the "*free gift is not as the offence.*" How do they differ, and what will finally result from the difference? In the 5th chap. of the book of Revelations, 11, 12, and 13th verses. "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. *And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.*" Will this prophecy ever be accomplished? And when it is accomplished, how many

of the creatures of God, or human beings, will be with the devil, "cursing and blaspheming God and Christ," as is frequently represented? In Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, 2d chap. 14th verse, we read of Christ, "forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also himself likewise took part of the same; *that through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.*" Will Christ effect his purpose, and destroy the devil? And if by destruction, misery and punishment are simply intended; was not the devil destroyed before Christ "took part of the same" flesh and blood? for the devil is universally believed to have been punished and in misery before Christ appeared on earth.—Does not the Prophet Malachi, in the 4th chap. 1st verse, refer to the destruction of the devil at the coming of Christ, when he speaks of the wicked as being destroyed "*root and branch?*" And if any thing is destroyed *root and branch*, is it possible for any part of it to remain? In I Corinthians, 15th chap. 26th verse, we read. "*The last enemy shall be destroyed, DEATH.*" The words *that*, and *is*, are not in the original. *When the last enemy shall be destroyed, root and branch*, will there be any enemy left? And if the devil has the power of death, and the wages of sin is death, and the works of the devil are to be destroyed agreeably to the testimony of John, in his 1st epistle, 3d chap. 8th verse, will not sin be destroyed root and branch? And will not the glorious period, and triumphant consummation then arrive? "When the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and he will dwell with them, and be their God, and they shall be his people. *And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be NO MORE DEATH, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be ANY MORE PAIN! For the former things are passed away.*" Rev. 21st chap. 3d and 4th verses. Is it any where in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, enjoined on man as a duty, that he shall contend earnestly for the *kingdom* of the *devil*, the length of his *reign*, the greatness of his *dominion*, and the number of his *subjects?* And is this kind of testimony, of the nature of the testimony of the Holy Ghost, whom Christ said should come, and should testify of Him? Believing the testimony of the Holy Ghost, who testifies of Christ, that "his kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom; and that to His dominion there shall be no end;" that "all the kindreds and families of the earth shall be blessed in him; and all nations worship before Him, and glorify his Name." We call upon all those who believe in the *devil's infinite power*, the duration of his *kingdom*, and the increase of his *dominion;* and who testify of his reign over an innumerable company forever! and who are offended to hear his destruction, and the utter and eternal ruin of his kingdom spoken of; to come forward and answer the above *questions*.

"Be ready, always to give an answer to every man." *Peter.*

"*Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come.*" John 8th chap. 21st verse.

THIS declaration of our Saviour, is quoted to prove the eternal misery of a part of mankind; and the construction generally put upon it would destroy the hopes of ninety-nine out of an hundred, of all the human race. What is it for a man to die in his sins? and is it because men die in their sins, that they cannot come to Christ? These are questions, which naturally present themselves to the mind, on reading this interesting portion of Scripture. We believe that there will be no controversy relative to the doctrine, that he that dieth in unbelief, dies in his sins, agreeable to the declaration, "This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men choose darkness rather than light." The light here spoken of is Christ, who is the true light; and the darkness is the unbelief, or sin spoken of in the text. The declaration is, they "*shall seek me.*" This was spoken of and to the Jews; and they are described by the prophets, and by Paul in his epistle to the Romans, 11th chap. 7 to 11th verses, as being in this dark and unbelieving state. "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded. According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this day. And David saith, let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a recompense unto them. Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway. *I say then, have they stumbled that they should FALL?* GOD FORBID!" What! Not fall when they die in their sins? NO! on the authority of Paul, we say NO. And on the authority of Christ, and his prophets, we say they did die in their *sins*. And Paul adds, "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, *but life from the dead.*" Rom. xi. chap. 25th ver. to the end of the chapter. "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits,) that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the DELIVERER, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins. As concerning the Gospel, they are enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes. *For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.* For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief; even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they may also obtain mercy: for God hath concluded them ALL IN UNBELIEF, that He might have MERCY UPON ALL." The believer, and the unbeliever, *ALL*. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of GOD! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! for who hath known the mind of the LORD? or who hath been his counsellor? or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again? for of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen." In answer to our question. *Is it because men die in their sins, that they cannot come to Christ?* It is proper to consider, whether living in their sins will enable them to come; or whether they can come of themselves. The declaration of Christ ought to be conclusive, it is so plain, "that he who runs may read. *No man can come to ME, except the Father draw him.*" There is not a more *positive* and *definite* declaration on record in any book, than this. Neither is it in the power of human reason to conceive of one more so, and yet it is denied by millions. In the 1st epistle of John 4th chap. 2d verse, we read, "every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God." And God by his prophet declares, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Will the Father then draw them? And will not "*all flesh*" come in the right way, and seek, and find, "when all are taught of God, from the least unto the greatest?" If any person will contend that a man's dying in his sins, is the reason, or cause, why he cannot come to Christ; such person would confer a favour, by informing whether the disciples of Christ whom he addressed in the following manner, died in their sins. John xiii. 33. "Little children, yet a little while I am with you; *ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come, so say I unto YOU.*" In the viii. chap. 23, 24th verses, Christ says, "Ye are from beneath; I AM from above; ye are of this world; I am not of this world. I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins; for if ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins." Reader, John in his first epistle 4th chapter and 14th verse, declares, "We have *seen, and do testify*, that the Father sent the SON to be THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD." On the authority of Jesus Christ, who is THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER; It is declared unto YOU, If YOU believe not that CHRIST is the SAVIOUR of the WORLD, *you shall die in your SINS!*

Remarks on Daniel, 3d chap. 4, 5, 6th verses.

"Then a herald cried aloud, To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, that at the time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up. And whoso falleth not down and worshippeth, shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace."

The IMAGES which are set up at this day, are not GOLD; but they are as diverse from the true GOD, as an image of gold would be. But the denunciations of the worshippers at this day, are precisely the same with the IDOLATERS, who worshipped the golden image set up by the king of Babylon; with this only difference, and which is highly creditable to the worshippers of the golden image; that whereas the fiery furnace of the idolatrous Medes and Persians inflicted but a momentary pain, the fiery furnace of our modern idolaters, is by them represented to TORMENT FOREVER!

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to become subscribers to this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can be furnished with the numbers, from the first.

To Correspondents.

All Communications forwarded to the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter-box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.
EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.
WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD-STREET.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1820. NO. 6.

The purposes of God are revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(*Continued.*)

We have seen, bythe concurring testimonies of scripture, that *salvation*, or *damnation*, in in the *orthodox* acceptation of the terms, were never intended by the Lawgiver Jehovah, to be effected by the law. And having *proved*, beyond the possibility of *refutation*, if the scriptures are of any validity, the negative; we now proceed to show from revelation the affirmative, or what was intended to be effected by the law. The scriptures are express, relative to the way of salvation, and the cause of damnation. "By man came death. The wages of sin is death. O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thy help. There is no other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we can be saved, but the name of Jesus." Therefore, the law was unnecessary to condemn, and it was imperfect, in that it could not save. In the 1st chapter of John's Gospel, 17th verse, we are told that "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Here is a manifest distinction made between the law, and grace and truth. The first is mentioned in contradistinction to the two last. The difference is obvious; the *law* promises nothing, except on condition of perfect obedience, for *he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all*, and in many things we offend all; and cursed is he that continueth not in all the things written in the book of the law, to do them." Therefore, "no man living can be justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident, for the just shall live by faith; *and the law is not of faith*, but the man that doeth them, shall live in them." The grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ, is altogether different from the law; for by grace and truth, is meant the favour and love of God, manifested in the fulfilment of the promises, by giving his Son to be the Saviour of a lost world. "Where sin abounded, there grace did much more abound; that as sin has reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." What was intended to be effected by the law? or in the words of Paul, "wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made;" and Paul asks the question, "is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." Galatians 3d chap. 19th to 21st verses. In the epistle to the Romans the declaration is positive relative to the intention of the law, see 5th chap. 20th verse. "Moreover, the law entered, that the offence might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin has reigned unto death, &c." It is evident that sin reigned unto death before the law, and righteousness or eternal life is not by the law. See 3d chapter Romans, 19th to 24th verses inclusive. "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore, by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the *law* is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ *unto all*, and *upon all them that believe, for there is no difference;* for *all have sinned*, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." Here is a full and complete exposition of the purposes of God, which he intended to effect by the law. The *law* was *added*, or *given*, because of transgression; and only for a time. The *law* entered or was given, "that the *offence*, or *sin*, might abound. And that *every mouth might be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God.*" See Heb. x. chap. 1st verse, where the law is said to have the shadow of good things to come; and not the image, &c. The law, therefore, is emphatically a teacher, or schoolmaster; and it teaches the sinner, that Christ is the only way of salvation, to the exclusion of every thing else, and by that teaching brings him to Christ. The sacrifices, and indeed every thing under the law, and appertaining to it, was typical of Christ, and pointed to him; and the Jews *erred*, and it is the *error* of this day, to look for salvation from the works of the law, and not from Christ; of whom the law, in all its requisitions, was but the shadow and type. I will illustrate this by a figure, which must be familiar to a child. The circulating medium of the day is paper money, bank-bills as they are generally called; and this paper medium, or money, is but a type, or shadow of the specie, which is silver and gold; and so long as this paper dispensation shall continue, these bills will be considered as money, and received as such; the receiver believing that he can obtain gold and silver for them. But if those who possess them, were to value them for their intrinsic merit, exclusive of the gold and silver, which they promise to pay on demand, they would fall into the same error with the Jews, and others at this day, who expect to receive from the law that which is only promised in Christ; with this difference at this day, that the dispensation of the shadow, the law, is closed; and if the government by law had declared gold and silver to be the only circulating medium, the folly on both sides would be equal, and the simile correct. The purpose of God in giving the law was merciful. The law was not given to destroy with eternal damnation the sinner, for "the law entered that the offence might abound." And the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ, hath abounded much more than the sin or offence, which is *measured* by the law; "for by the law is the knowledge of sin. I had not known sin, except the law had said thou shalt not covet." We therefore say, in the words of Paul, 3d chap. Romans, 31st verse, to 5th verse of 4th chap. inclusive, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law. What shall we then say that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by *works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God.* For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." How many churches, or congregations are there at the present day, who would allow Paul, if it were possible for him to come on this earth, or any other person, to preach this doctrine in the plain, and unqualified manner, which Paul preached it to the Romans? It is insufferable—What! are we to "bear the heat and burden of the day, and not receive even a penny?" NO, my friends not one *fraction!* And this on the authority of Paul, an apostle and servant of Christ. "*Well, if this is true, we will do any thing; what profit is there in serving God?*" this has been the answer of thousands. To such I would say, *in* keeping the commandments there is great reward, not *for* keeping them. And in the words of Paul, "tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." How many are there who, like unprofitable servants, will work while they think their master's eye is observing them, and who will obey his commands so long as they *see*, and *feel* his *rod*, and no longer? and whose language, and conduct, are an emphatic comment on the declaration, "I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hadst not strewed; *and I was afraid*, and hid thy talent in the earth." But "we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free. Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith *Christ hath made us free*, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, *whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.* For we through the spirit, wait for the hope of righteousness by faith." Galations 4th chapter, 31st to 5th verse of 5th chapter, inclusive. See the Acts of the Apostles, 15th chapter, 18th to 29th verses, inclusive. "Known unto God are all

his works, from the beginning of the world. Wherefore, my sentence is, that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God. But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollution of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. *For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him*, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day. Then it pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas; *namely*, Judas, surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren; and they wrote *letters* by them after this manner: The apostles, and elders, and brethren, send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia. Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, ye must be circumcised, *and keep the law*; *to whom we gave no such commandment.* It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul; *men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.* We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth. *For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost*, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; *from which, if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well.*" See 10th and 11th verses. "Now therefore why tempt ye God, *to put a yoke* upon the *neck* of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we are able to bear. But we believe, that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved, even as they."

We are authorized, by the tenor of Scripture, and the united testimony of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, to declare, that God's intention and purpose in giving the law, was that "That the offence might *abound*, and that where the offence abounded, *grace* should *much more abound.*"

Our second proposition is, *whether this purpose shall be accomplished.* See Matthew 22d chap. 37th to 40th verses. "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself On these two hang *all the law* and the prophets." Will this ever be accomplished? Will all men ever love their Creator and God with all their hearts, and their neighbours as themselves? We answer in the most unqualified manner, and without the least hesitation, *Yes, they will.* And we will prove it by the oath and declaration of Jehovah, against the *cavils*, *skepticism*, and *sophistry* of a world of unbelievers. In John, 7th chap. 49th verse, "But this people, who knoweth not the law, are cursed." Galatians, 3d chap. 10th verse. "For it is written, cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." See 119th Psalm, 1st and 2d verses. "Blessed *are* the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord. Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, *and that* seek him with the whole heart." Genesis, 28th chap. 13th and 14th verses. "I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed, and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south; and in thee, *and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*" Galatians, 3d chap. 16th verse. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not, and to *seeds*, as of *many;* but as of *one*; and to thy *seed*, which is *Christ.*" 13th verse. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." God sware to Abraham, saying, "*in thy seed,*" which *seed*, Paul says is *Christ*, "all the nations of the earth shall be blessed." The prophet declares, "*Blessed are they who walk in the law of the Lord.*" The apostle, "*cursed is every one* that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law, to do them." And in the 3d chap. to the Galatians, 13th verse, "Christ, the seed of Abraham," as explained in the 16th verse, "hath *delivered us from the curse of the law*, being made a curse for us." Isaiah, 42d chap. 21st verse, "The Lord is well pleased; for his righteousness' sake, he will magnify the law, and make it honourable." 49th chap 6th, 8th, 9th verses. "And he said, it is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, *that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth.* Thus saith the Lord, in an acceptable time have I heard thee; and in a day of salvation have I helped thee; and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant to the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages; that thou mayest say to the prisoners, *Go forth;* to them that are in darkness, *Shew yourselves.* They *shall feed* in the ways, and their pastures in all high places." 51st chap. 11th verse. "Therefore the redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing unto Zion; *and everlasting joy shall be upon their head;* they shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and mourning shall flee away." 55th chap. 10th and 11th verses. "For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven; and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; *so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.*"

Here is the positive declaration of God, that his word shall effect his purposes, and shall not return void; that word, which declared, "*thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.*" The testimony given by Jehovah, in Isaiah, 45th chap. 22d to 25th verses inclusive, is sufficient to satisfy any person, whose prejudices have not degraded him to a state of unbelief and opposition to revelation, equal to infidelity itself. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I *am* God, and *there is* none else. I HAVE SWORN BY MYSELF; the word is gone out of my mouth *in* righteousness, AND SHALL NOT RETURN; That unto ME EVERY KNEE SHALL BOW, every tongue SHALL SWEAR. Surely shall *one* say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength; *even* to him shall *men* come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory." The reader is requested to notice, that the words printed in *italics*, are not found in the original. The phraseology of the original text is remarkable. "All the ends of the earth," are called upon to "look unto God and be saved." The reason assigned is, that there is no God, or Saviour, besides HIM. "God has sworn by himself, that unto Him," the only God, and Saviour, "EVERY knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear." We ask the question, What! shall EVERY tongue swear? The 24th verse is an answer to this question. "Surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." Will this declaration, made by every man, in the presence of God, and on the bended knee, and sanctioned by an OATH, be truth? Would it not be madness to say the contrary? And would it not be as great madness, to say that those, who "had righteousness and strength in the Lord," were not heirs of salvation? The declaration is, that those who bow the knee, and swear, "to Him shall come." And we have the testimony of Christ, that "no man can go to the Father, but by him; or come to him, except the Father draw him." Paul, in his epistle to the Philippians, 2d chap. 10th and 11th verses, testifies to the same truth in similar words. "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

(To be continued.)

REVIEW *of a pamphlet, entitled "Calvinism and Arminianism, displayed in a series of Dialogues, between Mr. Predestinarian and Mr. Arminian. Wherein their arguments are properly advanced, and the determination of the matter left to the judgment of the candid reader.* New-York, printed by George Forman, 201 Fulton St. 1820."

In noticing this work, we shall confine ourselves to the ground of reasoning adopted by the *author;* the texts quoted by him in support of *his doctrine* of election, we shall not notice in particular at this time, as they will shortly come before the reader, in our discussions relative to "*the purposes of God, as revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.*" With respect to the second person in this dialogistical drama, the Arminian we shall say but little; for we think it would be unfair to make him accountable for *consequences*, when *he has* had no agency in the *cause;* but is set up in *effigy* by his religious opponent, and treated as heedless unthinking boys treat the hapless fowl on Christmas holidays; and like him, owes his escape to the bluntness of the weapon, and the unskilfulness of the marksman.

In the preface to these Dialogues, the *author* says, "the reader is at liberty to embrace that opinion which carries the *most Scripture* and reason in it." Taking *this advice* as our guide, we proceed to examine the arguments and deductions of this writer, and prove, that as far as reason and Scripture are admitted as a criterion, so far his arguments are destitute of, and contradictory to either. The subjects

under discussion are *election* and *reprobation*; objections are *put* in the *mouth* of the *Arminian*, and they are answered by the *principal* in a *manner*, which excites at times the *admiration* of the *Arminian*, at his *wonderful talent at exposition*. In the 19th page, the Arminian, with a view to prove the universality of the atonement, proposes the following question:

"*Arm.* But it is said, 1 Tim. ii. 26. He gave himself a *ransom* for *all*.

"*Pred.* That is for *all ranks* of men, such as *kings*, and those *who are in authority*.

"*Arm.* How do you know that?

"*Pred.* Because we read, verse 1st and 2d, I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, *be made for all men*. For kings, and for *all* that are in authority, &c. Now it is clear to me, that the word *all* in the 6th verse, refers to all in *authority* mentioned in the 2d verse, whom we are commanded to pray for.

"*Arm.* This still convinces me that salvation is *possible* for *all*; because we are commanded to pray for *all*.

"*Pred.* What conviction do you receive from this?

"*Arm.* My arguments are these. 1st. We are commanded to pray for all. 2d. We are commanded to pray in faith. Therefore we must *believe all* can be *saved*.

"*Pred.* These arguments carry a fair countenance to an inconsiderate mind. *But I* can produce *one reason* which will *overturn* all your *arguments*; and it is this. *There are some persons* whom we ought not to pray for, 1 John v. 16th. Therefore, of consequence, the words all men, in the beginning of the chapter, must allude to all ranks, or stations of men, and not to every individual.

"*Arm.* But it is said, verse 4th, who will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth.

"*Pred.* Observe, the words do not say, he is willing that all may be saved; but he will have all men to be saved. Now put the emphasis upon the words *will have*, and then you will see the inconsistency of your interpretation. For as he is a sovereign, his will is his law, and doth whatever is right in his own eyes, and none dare say, what doest thou? or can stay his mighty hand. Therefore, if he will have all to be saved, who can hinder? Then necessarily those words must allude to his elect amongst all *ranks* of men, whom he *will undoubtedly save*." We believe for wilful perversion of the scripture, and for absurdity, this Mr Predestinarian may challenge comparison. We will read the above quotations according to this orthodox rule, and the reader is requested to compare notes. "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, intercessions and giving of thanks, be made for a part of all men. For *some* Kings, and for *some* that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in some godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have some of all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and some men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for some of all; namely, some kings, and some that are in authority, to be testified in due time." The Predestinarian says, "I can produce one reason, which will overturn all your arguments." Let it be understood that by *arguments* here, are meant the declarations of the Apostle Paul, who mentions the word *all* five times as referring to God's will to have all saved. And Mr. Predestinarian has One! Reason, a very potent One surely, which can upset the WHOLE and prove Paul to be a fool and blockhead! And what is this wonder-working REASON? "It is this; there are *some* persons whom we ought not to pray for, 1st. John, v. chap. 16." Ans. Let John speak for himself. John, first epistle, 5 chap. 16th verse. "If any man see his brother sin a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life, for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death; I do not say he *shall pray for it*." Now, what is this sin which is unto death? We answer, it is any improper and unlawful conduct, which destroys a man's health, and precipitates him into a premature grave.

For the death here spoken of, is the temporal death of the body. And John, so far from saying that he shall not pray for his brother, if his brother sin a sin unto death, says "I will not say he shall pray for *it*." We ask, for what? Answer, for *it*; for the sin! It would be contrary to the express commands of Christ, if we were to do otherwise than pray for *all*. For he has commanded us to pray for our enemies; and himself set us the example, by praying for those, by whose hands he was slain. The reader is requested again to notice the reply of Predestinarian to Arminian, who interrogates, by saying. "It is said in verse 4th. Who will have *all* men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." And the reason assigned by *Pred.* is, wonderful to relate, because God will have *all* to be saved, it follows as a necessary consequence, that only a *part* of *all* will be *saved*. Suppose Mr. Predestinarian, that you have a debtor, who owes you ten thousand dollars; you send a messenger to him, who declares that it is your will that your debtor pay you ALL he owes you, *ten* thousand dollars. Your debtor, after receiving your message, is met by a neighbour, and the following dialogue takes place. *Debt.* Well neighbour, *Mr. Pred.* has sent me a message, that it is *his will* that I should pay him ALL the money I owe him. *Neigh.* You have then a large sum to raise, ten thousand dollars. *Debt.* Ten thousand dollars! say you, "Now it is clear to me, that the word all in the message delivered to me, refers to" the word *thousand*. *Neigh.* But the messenger says it is the will of *Mr. Pred.* that you pay *ten thousand*.

Debt. Observe the words do not say, he is willing that I should pay him all; but he will have all paid. Now put the emphasis upon the words *will have*, and then you will see the inconsistency of your interpretation. For as *Mr. Pred.* is a Sovereign, his will is his law, and doth whatever is right in his own eyes, and none dare say, what dost thou? or can stay his mighty hand. Therefore if he will have *all* to be" paid, who can hinder? Then necessarily those words must allude to the word thousand. And I can produce one reason, which will overturn all your arguments. For one of *Mr Pred.* servants was heard to observe, I will not say, that all the money due to *Mr. Pred.* shall not be payed to him. Therefore the words all I owe him, must allude to some of all of the dollars, in some of all, of some of the thousands, and not to every dollar. We are of the opinion friend Predestinarian, that you would consider this orthodox LOGIC but a sorry equivalent for your dollars. The ingenuity of Mr. Predestinarian is again exercised in his attempts to prove, by his quotations from the Scriptures, that the word all, was originally intended to mean only a part. The wire is again pulled, and Arminian says, We also read in 1 Corinthians, 15th Chap, 22d verse. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

"*Pred.* In this verse, it is evident, that the Apostle had an allusion to the resurrection, of which he had treated largely in that Chapter; and his meaning was, As in Adam all die, that is, subject to a natural death; even so in Christ shall all be made alive, that is, raised again at the resurrection."

"*Arm.* This may be the real meaning of these texts of Scripture for what I know; but I thought, that because it is said all men, they must mean all the race of Adam."

"*Pred.* The words all men in Scripture language do not mean *every* individual in the world. For it is said, John 3d. 26th. He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold the same baptizeth, and all men come to him. Matt. iii. verse 5, "Then went out to him all Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Yet we are informed, he forbade many of the Pharisees, and said, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come." Again, it is said, John 12th chap. 32d, verse "And I, if I be ifted up, will draw all men unto me." Now no person can suppose that these scripture mean every individual in the world; and if not, may we not reasonably by the same rule, believe, that the others mentioned before, mean only *some part* of mankind?" And as the words all men, in the scripture, do not always mean the whole race of Adam; so neither do the words every man, always mean *every* individual. For it is said, Mark viii. chap. 25th verse "After that, Christ put his hand again upon the blind man's eyes, and made him look up, and he saw every man clearly"

According to this manner of reasoning; if the word *all*, or *every one* is used in one place to denote a less number than the *whole* race of Adam, it is evident that it never means only a *part* of the race of Adam. We will take Mr. Predestinarian on his own ground, and think it will appear to every unprejudiced person, that he is *caught* in his *own snare*. The doctrine he vainly attempts to establish is, that the Atonement is for only a *part* of *all*. The Scriptures *abound* with *testimony*, that "*all* have *sinned* and come short of the glory of God." And Mr. *Pred.* has established the doctrine, that all only means a *part*, or *some* of *all*. Therefore, only a *part* of *all*, or *some* of *all*, "have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Consequently there is a *part who have not sinned*, nor *come* short of the glory of God. And the Scriptures, as well as Mr. *Pred.* declare, that Christ came to save those who were dead in trespasses and sins; and there being only a *part* of *all*, or *some* of *all*, who are dead in trespasses and sins; it follows that *all* who are *lost*, are saved; and those who are not *lost*, not needing any Saviour, we have a right, having judged Mr. *Pred.* out of his *own mouth*, TO PRONOUNCE HIM A UNIVERSALIST. If Mr. *Pred.* can bring *one* passage where the word *all* is used, and the

context justifies the extensive sense of the word, in the manner in which it does in 1st Timothy, 1st to 6th verses inclusive; and compare the context, with his quotations from John, 3d chap. 26th. Matthew, 3d chap. 5th, Mark, 8th chap. 25th, Revelations 6th chap. 15th verse, and make it appear that the context to every text quoted has a meaning and reference as extensive as the quotation from 1st Timothy 1st, to 6th verses, it shall be acknowledged that he has *some* reason, and *some* Scripture to support his hypothesis, and not till then. His quotation from John 3d, 26th, and Matthew, 3d, 5th, will not avail him any thing; unless he can prove that *all* the race of Adam were in Jerusalem, and Judea, and the region round about Jordan. Mr. *Pred.* asserts, "*that he forbade many of the Pharisees.*" Did he forbid them to come to be baptized? Or when they had come, did he forbid their going back to their homes? The account given by *Matthew*, and to which the reader is referred, states, that John baptized them; and told this *generation* of *vipers*, that Christ should "*baptize* them with the *Holy Ghost* and fire!" I would ask Mr. *Pred.* whether this generation of *vipers*, whom he has represented as *forbidden* by John, are not a *part* of *some* of *all* those spoken of by Paul in his epistle to 1st Timothy, 1st to 6th verse. His quotation from John, 12th chap. 32d verse "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw *all men* unto *me*;" which he associated with these, unquestionably with a view to dispose of it by WHOLESALE, and by that means prevent the necessity of noticing it in a particular manner, but simply declares, "Now *no person can* suppose that these Scriptures mean *every* individual in the world, &c."

We believe no person would suppose that the *whole* world was meant, when only a *part* was spoken of. But in the last quotation from John, there are thousands of persons who suppose that *every* individual is spoken of; and we challenge Mr. *Pred.* to *prove* to the contrary. His quotation from *Mark* viii. 25, relative to the man who was blind, and who, when restored to sight, "saw *every man clearly*," to be of any use to him, he must first prove, that he did not see *every man* clearly, who was near, or about him at the time. It is not to be supposed that he saw those who were at the distance of one thousand miles from him. The declaration relative to his seeing, was intended to be an account of his present condition; and without other men could see ALL the race of Adam, it would be absurd to suppose that he could. The quotation from 1st Corinthians, 4th chap. 5th, "Then, that is at the day of judgment, shall every man have praise of God," we believe proves too much for Mr. *Pred.* For on his own plan of *abridgment*, we think he must allow that by *every man*, is here meant *every man* who is judged at the day of judgment. And as the ELECT judge themselves in this world; agreeably to Paul, 1 Cor. 11th chap. 31st verse. "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged." And the declaration of Christ, that at the day of judgment, men shall be judged by that word which he spoke, and which he said was the commandment of the Father, and was LIFE EVERLASTING. See John, 12th chap. 46th to 50th verses inclusive. We are of opinion that Mr. *Pred.* will find more difficulty in expounding his quotations to the satisfaction of *reasonable* men, than he at first anticipated. His next quotation from Rev. 6th chap. 15th verse, reads thus; "And *every* bondman, and *every* free man hid themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains," &c. Mr. *Pred.* observes, we can't REASONABLY suppose this to be the case, &c. from which it would appear, that we must be very UNREASONABLE to suppose this to be *true*. He concludes this paragraph by saying, "But as the blind man saw *every* man clearly whom he did *see;* so Jesus Christ died for ALL and EVERY one of his elect, whom he did die *for*." We here find that the word EVERY, when applied to the ELECT, escapes for the *first time with a whole skin*.

Quere. Does not the word *every one*, mean *some*, a *part* of the *elect?* The final result, or conclusion in the mind of Mr. *Pred.* seems to be, that Christ died for the ELECT, who are a PART, of SOME, of ALL. In answer to an interrogatory from Mr. *Arminian*, in page 21st, from John 1st, 29th. "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world;" also, 1st John, 2d, 2d verse, "He is the propitiation for the sin of the WHOLE WORLD."

"Mr. *Pred.* Says it is also evident, that the whole world in Scripture, don't always mean *every* person in the world, as you may see, Luke 2d, 1st. "Then went out a decree from Cesar Augustus, that the WHOLE WORLD should be taxed. Rom. 1st, 8th. Your faith is spoken of throughout the WHOLE WORLD. 1st John, 5th, 19th. And we know that we are of God, and the WHOLE WORLD lieth in wickedness."

"Now we must not suppose that Cesar's decree extended throughout the *whole world*, as the whole world was not under his jurisdiction; nor can we suppose that every individual in the *whole world* had then heard of the faith of Rome; seeing many nations lay in darkness, destitute of Gospel light; or that the whole world mentioned by St. John means all the posterity of Adam, since he declares it to mean *only* a *part*." It is acknowledged with *pleasure*, that *here* is *some reason;* and we will make this a criterion, and see where Mr. *Pred. own* arguments will *land him*. The principle laid down is this; these texts do not mean the *whole world*, because their contexts explain that a *part* of the *whole* is meant. If this principle is *correct*, and we appeal *even* to Mr. *Pred.* who has introduced it, for the correctness of it, does it not follow, as an *inevitable* consequence, that where the context does not limit the text, that the text is to be taken in its full extent? We shall take it for granted that this *rule* is *correct*. We now ask the QUESTION; What is there in the context, to the texts quoted, from 1 Cor. XV chap. 22d verse, John XII, 32, 1 Cor. IV, 5, 1st epistle of John 11 chap. 2, verse and John 1, 29, which by this *rule* can be construed to limit and abridge the *text?* We answer, There is not even the shadow of a reason to be found. And Mr. *Pred.* admits the text quoted by him from 1 Cor. XV. 22, in its fullest extent. The words SOME, and PART of ALL, are HERE omitted. He acknowledges, "As in Adam ALL die, that is, subject to a natural death, EVEN so in Christ SHALL ALL be MADE ALIVE, that is, raised again at the resurrection." On this *one question*, therefore, let the matter at issue be placed. And we are happy in having it in our power, assisted by the revelation of God, to make Mr. *Predestinarian's* doctrine of eternal REPROBATION, *vanish like the* "*baseless fabric of a vision, and leave not a wreck behind.*" The 21st verse of this chapter *proves*, that it is at the resurrection of the DEAD when ALL MEN shall be MADE ALIVE IN CHRIST. Then follows the *text*, 22d verse—"As in Adam ALL die, even so in Christ shall ALL be made alive. 23d verse—But EVERY MAN in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward, they that are CHRIST'S at his coming." We now ask, Who are Christ's? God be praised, the answer is given in a manner, that EARTH and HELL cannot *controvert!* "For AS IN ADAM ALL DIE! EVEN SO! How? EVEN, or EXACTLY, or precisely to that EXTENT SHALL THEY BE MADE ALIVE IN CHRIST! The declaration is, "CHRIST, the *first fruits;*" agreeable to the same Apostle's declaration to the Colossians; "*The first born from the dead, that in all he might have the pre-eminence.*" And our text says, "AFTERWARDS." When? At the resurrection, when Christ comes to judgment. "AFTERWARDS, *they*, Who? Ans.—"EVERY MAN!" Hear O HEAVENS! and be astonished O EARTH! EVEN this UNBELIEVER! has been compelled by the FLOOD of EVIDENCE to acknowledge EVERY MAN? Consequently he has ACKNOWLEDGED that ALL! EVERY MAN! is CHRIST'S. For the declaration is, AFTERWARDS, THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S AT HIS COMING!

Now Mr. Predestinarian, what shall we say to your declaration, in your 21st page? "We cannot reasonably suppose that every man will have praise of God at the day of JUDGMENT." Would it not be very unreasonable to suppose the reverse? When the scriptures declare, and in the context to your text, "and as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the HEAVENLY. Now this, I say brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I shew you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but WE SHALL ALL BE CHANGED! In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the LAST TRUMP; for the trumpet shall sound, and the DEAD shall be raised INCORRUPTIBLE, and we SHALL be CHANGED. For this corruptible MUST put on INCORRUPTION; and this MORTAL put on IMMORTALITY. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, DEATH IS SWALLOWED up in VICTORY. O! DEATH, WHERE is thy STING? O! Grave, or Scheol, or Hades, or Hell! where is thy Victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of Sin is the LAW. But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!" Hear the conclusion of the whole matter, not a part of the whole; The Victory is Ours! through Our Lord and Saviour JesusChrist! And all creation cannot take it from us! Hallelujah!

Note.—Mr Predestinarian in the preface to his book, observes, "The desire of doing good has been the occasion of this publication." If that desire still remains, he is respectfully informed, that the columns of this Paper are at his service to renew his Dialogue whenever he thinks proper. And we pledge ourselves he shall not have an Arminian to deal with.

To Correspondents.

An answer to our remarks in the 4th No. relative to the *Cherubims*, will receive our *particular* attention next week, &c.

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to become subscribers to this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can be furnished with the numbers, from the first.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 3, 1820. NO. 7.

The purposes of God are revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(*Continued.*)

And John, in his first epistle, 4th chap. 2d verse, and 3th chap. 1st verse, declares, "Hereby know ye the spirit of God. Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God. Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." It is written, "They shall all be taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me;" is the declaration of Christ. Hebrews, 8th chap. 10th to 12th verses, inclusive. "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and *I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.* And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; FOR ALL SHALL KNOW ME, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." Surrounded as ye are with so great a cloud of witnesses, "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more *shall not* we escape, if we turn away from him that *speaketh* from heaven."

When will the purposes of God be accomplished?

"Of that day, and hour, knoweth no man, but the Father." The Father has revealed himself and his purposes in the Scriptures, which declare, that "in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he will gather together in one all things in Christ." And "God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, of the times of the RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS." And the Apostle Paul testified of Christ, that he "gave himself a ransom for all men, to be TESTIFIED IN DUE TIME." God, therefore, in His own good time, *which is the due time*, and the *fulness of time*, will be glorified, by working all things after the counsel of his own will. "Thy will be done, on earth, as it is done in heaven;" should be the prayer, and desire, of all men; for it is the "will of God that all men shall be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth."

"THE COUNSEL OF THE LORD STANDETH FOR EVER." We believe the *orthodox*, without any exception, are in the habit of attaching peculiar and unlimited credit to the endless misery of the non-elect, or *finally impenitent* sinners, as they please to call them; whenever the word *counsel*, or *decree*, is included in the same sentence with their anathemas. The question is never asked, whether the scriptures justify the connexion or application of the words? But they are used in all cases, where it is *in their* opinion necessary to add weight and energy to their denunciations; and stand in the same relation to them, that *blanks* do to an attorney's clerk; they fill them up with *names* and *date*, and the instrument is complete; and armed with this imaginary authority, they commit to the prison of HELL, mankind by *thousands*. In fact, the *Bible* itself is made use of as a modern *statute book;* the matter or cause to be supported, is found in their own imaginations, or those of their fellows, and the *Bible* is ransacked to find *clauses* to support it. And, as is *sometimes* the case in our common *courts*, one act, or section, is brought forward, with the ostensible purpose of destroying another section; and justice represented like Joseph's coat of many colours. In like mannner the scriptures are *tortured* and misconstrued, until the commentators, enshrouded in inconsistency, absurdity, and folly, the *mania* of infallibility seizes them, and the *diploma* of "DIVINE DOCTOR!" in the place of *wings*, wafts them high in the ethereal regions of incomprehensibility, where, producing an *eclipse* of the *truth*, they are, with wondering but *cautious* eyes, viewed with awful admiration by the crowd below. In discussing this part of our subject, it is proper that we should understand the meaning of the word *counsel*, when applied to Deity. In the common acceptation of the word, it is considered to be synonymous with advice; and when a man is counselled he is advised. We believe that commentators generally consider the words counsel and decree as synonymous, when applied to God. This definition is unquestionably the true one; for it cannot be supposed that an absolute infinite Being should receive advice, deliberate, or doubt; consequently, his purpose, will, pleasure, counsel, and decree, are the eternal determinations of an unerring mind, that cannot err; and must not only be synonymous terms when applied to him, but must be considered to be uniform in their object, and eternal in their consequences. The tenor of Revelation justifies these remarks. The word counsel occurs four times, where it is applied expressly to God; and is explanatory, by its connexion, of the purpose intended to be effected by him; which purpose is defined to be his counsel. The first is recorded in the 33d Psalm, 11th verse. The counsel of the Lord, in the context, is contrasted with the counsel of man. The prophet declares, that the word of the Lord made the heavens; he calleth upon the inhabitants of the earth to fear the Lord; "for he spake, and it was; he commanded, and it stood fast. The Lord bringeth the counsel of the heathen to nought; he maketh the device of the people of none effect." What was the counsel of the heathen, and the device of the people? Psalm 2d, 1st to 8th verses, inclusive, contains the answer. "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, *saying*, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the DECREE; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give *thee* the HEATHEN THINE INHERITANCE, and the uttermost parts of the EARTH THY POSSESSION." The Psalmist, in this chap. instructs us, that the people and the heathen raged and imagined a vain thing; and the kings of the earth and the rulers took counsel together, &c. and their object was to destroy the anointed of God, the Saviour of the world, Jesus Christ. In the verse preceding our text first quoted, 33d Psalm, 10th verse, it is declared, "The Lord bringeth the counsel of the heathen to nought; he maketh the device of the people of none effect." Now read the following verses, and rejoice; for SALVATION, not DAMNATION, is the *theme*. "The counsel of the Lord standeth FOR EVER, the thoughts of his heart to ALL GENERATIONS. BLESSED is the NATION whose GOD is the LORD; the PEOPLE he hath CHOSEN for *his own* INHERITANCE." Who are these *blessed* PEOPLE whom God hath CHOSEN? and *chosen* by that *counsel*, which standeth *for ever!* Hear, *unbelieving earth*, and rejoice, *believing heaven*. "I will DECLARE *the* DECREE;" the HEATHEN are the PEOPLE, that INHERITANCE; the *uttermost* parts of the EARTH, that *nation*, that POSSESSION. With such TRIUMPHANT views of the *gooodness* of GOD, well might the enraptured Psalmist burst forth in that exalted strain; "*Praise* the Lord, all ye NATIONS; *praise* him all ye PEOPLE; for his MERCIFULL KINDNESS is GREAT TOWARD US, and the *truth* of the Lord endureth FOR EVER!" And the prophet Isaiah, cheered with this heavenly vision of *Salvation*, and directed by the finger of heaven to this glorious consummation, lifts his voice and joins the adorating theme, "Praise the Lord, call upon his name; declare his doings among the people; make mention that his name is exalted. Sing unto the Lord, for he has done excellent things; this *is* known in all the earth. Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion; for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee. I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions; and, as a cloud, thy sins; return unto me, for I have redeemed thee. Sing, O ye heavens; for the Lord hath done it. Shout, ye lower parts of the earth; break forth into singing, ye mountains, O forest, and every tree therein; for the Lord hath redeemed Jacob, and glorified himself in Israel." The counsel of the Lord is again spoken of, in Isaiah, 46th chap. 10th

verse. The prophet introduces his subject, by contrasting the idols, the gods of the heathens, with the one living and true God. The gods of the heathen are represented as bowing down, and stooping, and going into captivity. The house of Jacob is called upon to hearken to the God who made them; and the *question* is asked, "To whom will ye liken me?" &c.

The origin of the idols is then reverted to; they are declared to be the work of the goldsmith, and the worshippers are represented as bearing their gods upon their shoulders, instead of their gods bearing them; and that in the place where they set them, they stand, and cannot remove. The worshippers of idols are called upon to remember this, the impotence of their golden deities, to "remember the former things of old; for I *am* God, and *there is* none else; I *am* God, and *there is* none like me; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times *the things* that are not *yet* done, saying, *My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure*, calling a ravenous bird from the east, the man that executeth my counsel, from a far country; yea, I have spoken; I will also bring it to pass. I have purposed; I will also do it. Hearken unto me, ye stouthearted, that *are* far from my righteousness; I bring near my righteousness; it shall not be far off, and my salvation shall not tarry; and I will place SALVATION in Zion for Israel my glory." How different is the doctrine contained in this *divine* passage, from the *orthodoxy* of the day.

The end declared by the counsel and purpose of God, is SALVATION.—Stouthearted idolaters are called upon to *hearken*, even those that are far from righteousness; and it is declared, "I, God, bring near my *righteousness;* it shall not be far off," &c. The righteousness of the creature is not once spoken of, or even alluded to; and yet the *salvation* shall not tarry; "for *God will place salvation in Zion* for Israel his glory!" God is here represented as the *author and finisher of our faith*, and man, the *passive* recipient of his mercy. The word counsel, as applied to God, next occurs, with its concomitant, salvation, in Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, 1st chap. 11th verse, and is the best comment on the text quoted from Isaiah, 46th chap. 10th verse, and its context. Unfortunately for a considerable part of the Christian community, their *spiritual teachers* have a *mortal antipathy* to the 10th verse of this chapter, and generally *avoid* it with the same care that the unfeeling Levite manifested, when he saw the poor man who was wounded by thieves, and lay by the road side; *they pass by on the other side.* We believe the same motive governs our modern commentators which influenced the Levite in the parable. The Levite was afraid of his purse; there was a claim upon his charity.—The sanctity of these modern saints is in danger. Salvation the lot of all men! What! shall WE go to *heaven* with SINNERS? Shall the *spotless, unsullied purity* of *our* PERSONAL HOLINESS be mixed in the *hellish throng*, and *lost*, undistinguished amidst crime, and hid, like a candle under a bushel, beneath this huge mass of *anti-orthodoxical impurity?* NO, *my good friends*, your robes of righteousness will be torn from your backs, and thrown, undistinguished, among the vices of "publicans and harlots, who will enter the kingdom of heaven before you." Your pretensions are *rotten;* they are the effervescence of an imagination crazed with dignified notions of *self* righteousness, *personal holiness*, and the flattering, *divine* appellations, which are showered upon your heads in *diplomatic* profusion by your *titled* coadjutors. *Doctor* Paul, the Apostle and servant of Christ, was dignified by the honest appellation of CHIEF OF SINNERS! the words PERSONAL HOLINESS! never escaped his lips. The self-abased Paul preached nothing, save Jesus Christ and him crucified. The prison, the scourge, was his reward from men; and every opprobrious epithet, which malice could dictate, or sectarian purity inspire, was heaped upon his head, until the scaffold opened the way to peace and heaven! God, in his good providence, has interposed the secular arm, or the prison, the whip, the scaffold, and the stake, would now be the *posts* which mark the road to heaven.

The text last quoted, from Paul's 1st epistle to the Ephesians, 1st chap. 11th verse, is in perfect harmony with the declarations of the Psalmist and prophet; and with its context is comprehensive, plain, and consolatory. Paul introduces his epistle by declaring himself an Apostle of Christ, by the will of God, and addresses himself to the saints and faithful in Christ Jesus. He informs them of the grace or favour of God and Christ towards them, and speaks of God's having blessed them with spiritual blessings in Christ, according to his counsel or purpose, before the world began; that they should be children, &c. and that they are accepted to the glory of God in Christ the beloved, in whom they had redemption and the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace, not the merit of their works, and that God had made known to them "the mystery of his WILL, according to HIS GOOD PLEASURE, which he hath PURPOSED in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in ONE;" who? the *elect*, the *orthodox*, or *those* that believe in the *damnation* of their *neighbours*,—the *good men* who go to *our church*, and have *personal holiness*. WE, US? NO! not *one* of these LIES ever escaped the mouth, or found a place in the head or heart of Paul. Who then are the *favoured* FEW? Who are the *little chosen company* who are in God's good pleasure to be gathered together in Christ? "Let the earth rejoice, and the multitude of the isles thereof be glad;" it is "ALL THINGS IN CHRIST, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, *even* in him." Then follows the text quoted; "In whom we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." We ask the question, What *purpose* does Paul refer to in this 11th verse? Answer,—It is explained in the 9th and 10th verses. It is the good pleasure of God, which he hath purposed in himself; it was once the mystery of his will, because unknown; and it is the *salvation* of all in heaven, and all in earth, in Christ. And Paul *predicates* his *own* salvation upon God's *purpose* to save ALL. The salvation therefore of ALL is the COUNSEL of GOD! and the predestination Paul speaks of in the 11th verse, is explained in the 12th, "That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ." Compare this with the context to the 10th verse of the 46th chapter of Isaiah, "I bring near my righteousness; it shall not be far off, and my salvation shall not tarry; and I will place salvation in Zion for Israel my glory." The reader will please to notice that Israel is here called the glory of God; and Paul, in the text quoted from 1st chap. Ephesians, says, "that we should be to the *praise of his glory*, who *first* trusted in Christ," and in the 14th verse, "which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession unto the praise of his glory." The reader is requested to read the whole of the next chap. the 2d. It is there declared, that those who were afar off, are now made nigh by the blood of Christ, not by their own works; and that Christ is our peace; that he hath broken down the middle wall of partition, "having abolished in his flesh the enmity, *even* the LAW of COMMANDMENTS contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain," or two, or Jew and Gentile, which are *all men*, "one new man, *so* making peace." All the race of Adam, therefore, without exception, are the GLORY of GOD! How pertinent and beautiful is the declaration of the prophet in Psalm 86th, 9th verse, "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall *glorify* thy name." And John's prophetic vision, recorded in Revelations, 5th chap. 13th verse, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, *be* unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." The 4th and last declaration relative to the *counsel* of God, is recorded in Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, 6th chap. 17th verse. It is remarkable, from its connexion and reference to the promises of God, which are the foundation of every hope, and the promulgation of which, is the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. This interesting subject is introduced by Paul, in the 13th verse; "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying, Surely, blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee; and so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise; for men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation, is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the IMMUTABILITY *of his* COUNSEL, confirmed it by an OATH, that by two immutable things in which *it was* impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge, to lay hold on the hope set before us, which we have as an anchor of the soul, both SURE and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil." Comment here is, or ought to be, unnecessary. What, let me ask, is considered among men of greater validity than an oath? and how common is it for men to place their lives, reputations, and property, every thing that can be dear in this life, at issue upon the oath of a jury? A jury of men who can, and we fear do, sometimes lie! and frequently mistake, and, strange to tell, the OATH *of* GOD, who cannot lie, and with whom deception is impossible, is of no regard! God has SWORN by himself, that all the NATIONS, FAMILIES, and KINDREDS of the EARTH, shall be BLESSED in CHRIST, the SAVIOUR of the WORLD! Who, let me ask, believes God?

How common is it for men to say, It is good to doubt a little; you must not be too sure; God is not so merciful as you think he is; *there is something for us to do.* We must be co-workers with God; and if our works will not save us, we shall be damned without them; there is no knowing how the matter will finally turn out,—it is best to go SURE; that is, God may change his mind, and to make the FOUNDATION STRONG, we must put our *righteousness, our good works,* for a *corner stone* in the foundation, and then WE SHALL BE SURE! Sure of what? Answer,—DAMNATION!!! There never was, nor never will be, a man, who made this doubting, temporizing, co-working, corner-stone building, sure-going policy, his rule, but lived in doubt and fear; and in the dread of, and consciousness of, condemnation, or damnation and misery. This cannot be controverted. There are some, it is acknowledged, who think but little about salvation, or condemnation. Of the thinking part of the community, however, there can be but two alternatives, either to trust in Christ, the "Saviour of all men," or in their own merit. The third party, which might be named in contradistinction to these two, and who pretend to trust in Christ, on account of a particular election, are, at bottom, nothing more, nor less, than Pharisees refined, and build all their hopes of election on evidence based on their OWN RIGHTEOUSNESS! We believe this cannot be controverted. If there are any who think it can, their *objections* will be received with *pleasure.* In the words of Paul, we are determined to "know nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified." Any other *name*, or *way* of salvation, dignify it with what appellation you please, whether ELECTION, GOOD WORKS, BAPTISM, KEEPING THE LAW, or any other *name* or *way*, which human ingenuity, fear, or pride, may invent, we shall consider as mere RUBBISH! "A man is a Christian in proportion as he trusts in Christ alone for salvation," to the exclusion of every thing else which can *possibly* be imagined or *named under heaven.*—And, finally, in the words of Paul—"Therefore, leaving the *principles* of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection, *not* laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. And this will we do, if God permit."

Note. In our next Number we shall consider "*The purpose of God according to Election.*

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Your observation on my last answer to your's in the Gospel Herald, are by no means agreeable to, or correspond with my ideas of the providence of God. Truth is one of the greatest and most essential of the whole Bible; this volume contains an internal, as well as an external sense, and I have learned from its sublime correctness to my ideas from reason, and an earnest investigation of its most sacred contents.

The extent of the providence of God, and his divine attributes, are little considered; the want of the knowledges of these perfections of the Deity, is much to be lamented; the learned are above searching for these knowledges, trusting in their knowledges of natural scientifics, in preference to the spiritual knowledges, so well known by the ancients, who expressed these knowledges by hieroglyphics, and at this day are to be seen in paramids erected by the Egyptians, as correspondences of such spiritual things as they represented.

Cherubims were representatives, and commanded by the Lord to be erected and placed as a guard, defence, and protection of those divine and spiritual knowledges, displayed and given by God to the Jews; and were considered by them as protection of those truths contained in the word he gave to them. To repeat the texts of scripture would be too extensive; but I will mention the places where they may be read. The first are 25th chapter Exodus, 18th and 22d verses; 26th chap. 31st verse; 37th chap. 7th verse; 1st book Kings, 6th chap. 23d and 28th verses; 8th chap. 7th verse; 2d book Chronicles, 5th chap. 8th verse; and St. Paul in 9th chap. Hebrews, 5th verse; and in several more places, where they are not spoken of as angels, or living spirits, but as representatives of the Lord's divine power, operating from and by his providence, to open and extend his word, that HE might fill the understandings, man, with the knowledges necessary for his salvation. You ask for my prototype. I answer, the Bible; the word that I have been reading and studying for more than seventy years. I have learnt to search the scriptures, and am told that in them are the words of eternal life; and our blessed Lord further adds, "They are they which testify of me:" And to show the providence of God, in the 10th chapter of Matthew, 29th and 30th verses, he informs us, that a sparrow shall not fall to the ground, and that the very hairs of our head are numbered.

You conceive Adam was the first man: If so, from whence did Cain get his wife? The Eastern people calculate time by the moon's circuit much longer than we do.

Was the tree of life a real tree, growing in the earth, and bearing fruit of a valuable and delicious nature; or was it the internal state of the man of the church, which God had formed and required his guardian care and protection, on purpose that those evils should not destroy his spiritual communications with the Lord? It appears to me something of this nature formed the tree of life, and required that care the providence of God extended, to protect, defend, and lead man to heaven; and that this providence was represented by the cherubims, and the flaming sword, to prevent those evils of self-love, and delusive persuasions, which are of so destructive a nature, that they destroy the soul, and render it impossible to be happy for ever.

The prophet Ezekiel, in the 10th chapter, is quoted in your fourth Number, where wheels and cherubims are representative of the state of the Jewish and other churches at that time. I have never read of angels having four faces, four wings, and four hands on one body, as the prophet saw them. Such were the visions the evangelist St. John saw in his Revelations, which were all representative of what should take place in time to come; that those errors which had taken place in the church of the Lord should be removed, corrected, and destroyed in time; and that a real and true church should be established, and teach all men to know the Lord Jesus Christ alone, as the only true and living GOD.

The operations of the Lord's divine providence are numerous, but all act according to his order, from which HE never departs. The human mind consists of two parts, the will and the understanding. The affection of love, or good, belongeth to the will, for what a man loves he does, and acts according to the will principle. But the affection of faith, or truth, belongs to the understanding. When this is suffered to rule, all is well; but when the will separates itself from the understanding, it then rejects the counsel of the Lord, and is governed by self-love, a very dangerous principle. Conscience will always do its duty, and remind us of those errors we have been guilty of; for it is from, and by this faithful monitor, the Lord speaks to the will and understanding of man. The seeds of eternal love are sown in the affections of every man living; but according to the cultivation of our affections, such is the production of this heavenly seed. If we practise and follow the Lord's advice in this world, and fill our affections with every good; pursue the practice from pure motives of love in thought, word, and deed, then this heavenly seed grows to maturity, and brings forth fruit in abundance, and to perfection. But if we neglect this cultivation, and suffer an evil influence to rule, govern, and guide our actions, reject or pervert the heavenly influence (for it flows from its divine fountain, pure to all men alike) on its descent, then the infernal weeds of destruction grow up in our minds, and the seeds of eternal love are prevented from growing up in our affections, and we become wicked and infernal, choosing spiritual death, which is damnation, instead of eternal life, and suffer infernal spirits to be our rulers and guides, and who are sure to lead us to eternal misery and confusion.

How necessary is it for parents to watch over their children, the rising generation, and instil into their tender minds every affection of a good and heavenly nature, while they are in the states of innocence, and capable of receiving heavenly instructions.

REMAKKS.

Our correspondent says, "Your observations on my last answer to your's in the Gospel Herald, are by no means agreeable to, or correspond with, my ideas of the providence of God."

In his communication, see 4th No. 16th page, speaking of Christ, he says, "Being the ruler and governor of all things, both spiritual and natural, by the order and permission of a *Divine Providence,* he causes all things to work together for good to them that love Him; and this *Divine Providence was the Cherubims,*" &c. And in the above communication, speaking of the *Cherubims,* he says, "And in many more places where they are not spoken of as angels, or living spirits, but as representatives of the Lord's divine power, *operating* from and by his *Providence.*" We believe a very superficial view of this kind of reasoning will detect and expose its *great* inconsistency. The texts quoted by him to prove that Cherubims are not living creatures, we think proves, on his plan, a little too much for his hypothesis. We read in 1st Kings, 7th chap. 23d to 25th verses, that Solomon made a molten sea, and that it stood, or was supported, by twelve oxen. According to this method of reasoning, because these oxen are not said to be living creatures, there are no oxen but wooden ones, or inanimate figures, &c. Let it be understood, that

in every text quoted by him, the Cherubims spoken of are the work of men's hands, and figurative; and as the creature cannot create, so of necessity these Cherubims cannot be living creatures. The Cherubims spoken of by Ezekiel were not the work of men's hands, neither were the Cherubims which were placed to guard the tree of life made by men; and Ezekiel declares positively, that they were living creatures, and that he saw them fly. We submit to the reader to decide what quantity of *negative* evidence, of the kind produced by our correspondent, is necessary to invalidate the positive declaration and testimony of the prophet of the Most High!

Our correspondent asks the question, "You conceive Adam was the first man; if so, from whence did Cain get his wife?" &c.

It is a fact, that we consider Adam as the first man, and we have two very good reasons for so doing. And first, we have never heard of any man before him. Second, the scriptures inform us that Adam was the *first man*. See 1st Cor. 15th chap. 45th verse, "And so *it is written*, the *first man* Adam was made a living soul!" Relative to Cain's wife, and the common error that he married her in the land of Nod, the Scriptures afford no evidence to support that opinion; the declaration is, that Cain *dwelt* in the land of Nod, and *knew* his wife; not that he married her in the land of Nod. The scriptures declare that Adam begat *daughters*. *Quere*—from whence did they get their husbands? We think this question, correctly answered, will remove all difficulty relative to Cain's wife! In answer to our correspondent's remark, "I have never read of *angels* having four faces, as the prophet saw *them*," I would simply ask, if he never read of it, where did he get the knowledge of the fact, that the prophet did see them? Or were they devils that the prophet saw? He likewise speaks of "*all* men being taught to know the Lord Jesus Christ as the only true and living God, and that the *seeds* of eternal love are sown in the affections of *every* man living; and that the *infernal weeds of destruction* prevent the *seeds* of eternal love from growing, and the consequence is eternal misery. We should like to learn, how those who know the Lord Jesus Christ alone, and these *all* men! And the seeds of eternal love sown in all men, how these can promote the growth of *infernal weeds?* Are these weeds possessed of more than eternal fecundity? And is that soil which is blessed with the knowledge of Christ, which is eternal life, so poor, that it is impossible for any thing but infernal weeds to grow in it?

Note.—We did not ask for our correspondent's prototype, but the Cherubims; and if the Bible is his prototype, is it not as much the prototype of all men? And correctly speaking, is it the prototype of any one of the race of Adam?

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—What you have written in your 1st, 2d and 3d Numbers, on the "Attributes of God, as demonstrated from reason, and revealed in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments," has led my mind to a serious inquiry, whether the doctrines held by Calvinists, or those you inculcated, for I perceive that you believe in the salvation of all men, harmonize with these attributes or perfections of our Creator, which appear to be viewed in the same light, both by you and them? Thus I consider the question between you fairly at issue; and he who fails to prove that his system rests on this foundation, or in the words of the Great Master Builder, that his deeds are wrought in God, will assuredly be ashamed when he cometh to this light.

Now, Sir, although I have been a member of a Calvinistic Baptist Church, for some nine or ten years, and am not disposed to be carried about with every wind of doctrine, yet, if the system I have embraced be error, I am as ready to exchange it for truth, as though I had adopted it but yesterday; and as your columns are devoted to theological discussion for every religious denomination, I feel it my duty to urge those with whom I have been so long in fellowship, especially those in the ministry, to a compliance with the injunction of Peter, 1st epistle, 3d chap. 15th verse, "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear."

Some few weeks since I heard a minister preach from a passage in Psalms, "Praise ye the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever." I heard him speak of the mercy of God with great delight, and could not imagine that any one could find fault; it was, however, the unhappiness of his brother in the ministry to be highly dissatisfied, as he took occasion, in the afternoon, to express to the same audience his regret, that his brother, in the morning, had talked much about the mercy of God, but nothing about his justice. Now, Mr. Editor, you attempt to prove, that the exercise of one of these attributes, is the exercise of both; and I am not prepared to decide whether you have succeeded; but if you have, it follows, that the dissatisfied brother's objections are removed, and that he can never substantiate the doctrine that God deals only in mercy with some of his creatures, while he administers justice, without mercy, to the remainder; though the remainder are probably much the greatest number.

I have heard the above objector since declare, from his pulpit, that his "soul abhorred the doctrine of Christ's atoning for the sins of those who go to hell, and suffer for their own sins, either by way of atonement, or as a chastisement; sarcastically observing, that it would be pretty rough chastisement; and adding, that the same justice that sent the sinner to hell, would pursue him with the wrath of God to all eternity."

Now, I wish to know, whether this minister understands really what the sentiments of the people, against whom he directs his philippics, are? As far as I can learn, from what I have heard and read, they do not go further than to say, "the body returns to dust, and the spirit to God who gave it." And as "God is the Father of the spirits of all flesh," He is the only being under whose care this immortal spirit, with all its mighty concerns and destinies, could safely and rightfully be placed. That they do not believe it consistent with the character of God as Father, to inflict any other suffering upon his children, either as to degree, or duration, in any state, than he is able and will render subservient to their greatest good.

I have heard it declared, that if Christ died for all men, the final salvation of all men is the most certain and infallible result; while others affirm, that the scriptures furnish a host of testimony, a cloud of witnesses, to prove the fact, and not a single positive declaration to prove the contrary.

Another declaration which I have heard from the pulpit, I have not been able, as yet, to reconcile; remarking upon Rom. 5th chap. 18th verse, "Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification;" the speaker observed, that common sense would revolt, or words similar, at the absurdity of supposing a person justified after being condemned, and the sentence executed; which, he said, was the case with the sinner, that in this life he was condemned by the law, and at death the sentence executed. Now, if the Apostle to the Hebrews understood the matter, we must conclude that it is appointed once for men to die, and after this the judgment." *Heb. 9th chap. 27th ver.* I am not able to imagine, why it is not as great an outrage to common sense, to suppose a sinner judged twice, condemned, sentenced, and executed twice; indeed, if there is no other way than this to get rid of such declarations of Scripture, in favour of the justification of all men, I would rather be found among those who believe them just as they are presented to us by an inspired Apostle, though the consequence might be the destruction of Calvinism, root and branch; and the reproach be the same with that of the Apostle, who declared, that "for this cause he both laboured and suffered reproach, because he trusted in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe." I think proper to inform the religious world in general, who claim to be orthodox, if they are not already apprized of the fact, that the Gospel Herald, and the doctrines it inculcates, are becoming alarmingly popular, some of almost every denomination having subscribed for the paper.

And I beg leave to address myself to the Reverend clergy, beseeching them to come forward and avail themselves of the advantage they have, in using its own columns, to disprove its doctrines, and so disarm them of their power and influence over the minds of the people; for I perceive already, that many are attributing their backwardness, to a want of evidence of the truth of their system, to maintain the contest, or ensure to themselves victory.

(*To be concluded next week.*)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Moses and the Burning Bush.

See yonder cross; come turn aside
And this great sight behold,
Vehement flames of wrath divine,
On Christ the man take hold.
That bush did burn with fiercest flame,
Yet unconsum'd it stood.
The man Almighty wrath sustain'd,
Because the man was God.
Awhile his body breathless lay,
To show the flame was dire;
But uncorrupted soon it rose,
His body quench'd the fire.
That hour unites his church in one,
On him the flame did rush,
And not a branch, or twig was burn'd,
For God was in the bush. S. K.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl-street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD-STREET.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1820. NO. 8.

The purposes of God are revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(*Continued.*)

It is impossible for human reason to conceive of a doctrine, fraught with sentiments and consequences, of that abominable, unscriptural, and CURSED nature, which are the distinguishing and essential features and principles of the *modern "doctrine of election."* From whence then did it originate? *Ans.* From the *father of lies;* from the progenitor of moral delusion, and every species of antichristian policy and error. And its destruction is as certain, as the destruction of its author and cause is certain; and that is as sure, as the irrevocable decree of Jehovah is sure. We have proved by the scriptures, that the counsel of God is salvation, and the happiness of the whole family of created intelligences, is the glorious effect of the salvation of God. And as the happiness of man is guaranteed by the counsel and purpose of God, his immutability ensures its duration, beyond the utmost stretch of the ken of mortals. As long then as the counsel of the Lord endureth, so long shall the happiness of all the "*nations* whom God has made" endure; the counsel of the devil, and the hellish wishes of his adherents, to the contrary notwithstanding. Therefore, "Praise the Lord, all ye nations: Praise him, all ye people; for *his* merciful kindness is great towards us, and the truth of the Lord endureth for ever!" Inexpressibly abhorrent are our feelings to this God-dishonouring, man-destroying doctrine of election; which was dragged from the jakes of moral impurity and corruption, by that infuriated persecutor, John Calvin; and by him propagated, and his infernal purpose sealed with the murder of his unoffending opponent, whose blood crimsoned the hands of this sanguinary reformer, and sanctioned, with hellish crime, this mission of destruction. Error, this was the moment of thy triumph! Then was the Saviour of the WORLD "crucified afresh." Then was the "blood of the covenant counted an *unholy thing;*" and its insufficiency to save the soul, without the assistance of a decree announced; a decree, the "lightest word of which" would bring disgrace upon degradation, and crimson, with the blush of shame, the prince of HELL! In discussing the subject, relative to the purposes of God, according to election, we shall confine ourselves to the scriptures of his word. Human authorities we respect; and when *human purposes* are the *thing* in question, then, and not till then, shall they be admitted in evidence, and never in competition with, or against the word of God. Eternal praises be ascribed to *our God,* that he has not left himself, nor his creatures, without a witness of his love and goodness; a witness, which is more than sufficient to silence and confound the opposers of Christ our Saviour, and to detect the errors which Antichrist has showered upon the world, by the hands of his unhallowed emissaries and deluded followers. That God has elected, chosen, ordained, and set apart, which terms are synonymous in scripture, some of the family of man, for purposes of love and mercy, we cheerfully and readily acknowledge; and instead of inferring from this, that God is partial to a few, and regardless of the rest of his creatures, we think the contrary is evident, from the whole tenor of scripture; and that those who are elected, are chosen by him, and ordained, as *servants,* for the good of those who are, by our *wise men!* stigmatized as "*non-elect,* and fit *fuel for the devil.*"

The word elect, first occurs in the scriptures, in the prophecy of Isaiah, 42d chap. 1st verse. This subject is continued to the close of the 45th chapter. And it is not possible for any persons, unless their eyes are blinded, their ears stopped, and their understandings perverted by the errors and delusions of Calvinism, to read this interesting portion of God's word, and not see, clear as the noonday sun, the universal goodness of God. Christ is the elect here spoken of. "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, *in whom* my soul delighteth. I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles." In the 6th and 7th verses, God's purpose, according to election, is more fully expressed. "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light to the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring the prisoners from the prison, *and* them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." This is the Scripture account of the doctrine of election. We will compare this with other parts of the Scripture, and the reader is requested to make his own comments. Isaiah 61st chap. 1st and 2d verses. "The Spirit of the Lord God *is* upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the PRISON to *them that are bound;* to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; TO COMFORT ALL THAT MOURN." First Epistle of Peter, 3d chap. 18th to 20th verses; "Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the SPIRITS IN PRISON; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." Fourth chap. 6th verse, "For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them THAT ARE DEAD, that *they* might be *judged* according to men *in the flesh,* but *live* according to God in the *spirit.*" It is worthy of remark, that Christ, who is the elect spoken of, is to "bring forth judgment to the Gentiles." And commentators who would construe judgment to mean damnation, would in this instance destroy even the elect themselves. It is well known that the scriptures include all the race of Adam, under the appellations of Jews and Gentiles. And the evidence here being conclusive, that Christ is the elect, or chosen of God, to lighten, open the eyes, and release from prison the Gentiles, and all being Gentiles who are not Jews, we think the *disciples* of *Calvin* will find an insurmountable difficulty with this, the strongest and most conclusive testimony in the whole Scriptures, relative to the design of God in election. Unfortunately for their hypothesis, the words *part, some,* &c. not only do not occur, but the testimony relative to *all* being the gainers, INDISCRIMINATELY, by Christ being the elect of God, and elected to be the Saviour of the WHOLE, without the smallest possible ground of doubt, must strike like a thunderbolt, and tear from the very foundation, *their dear, discriminating, electing love.* We have already observed, that this subject is continued to the close of the 45th chap. of Isaiah. In the 4th verse of this chapter, Jacob and Israel are called the elect. And the 17th verse declares, "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation." And God declares, by his prophet, in the 23d and 24th verses, "I have sworn by myself; the word is gone out of my mouth, RIGHTEOUSNESS, and shall not return, that unto me, EVERY knee shall bow, EVERY tongue shall swear; surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength, to him shall come; and ALL that are incensed against him shall be ashamed." Where now, ye *partialists,* where are your non-elect? Where is *your* devil with his *liege subjects?* Where are your *racks* and your *torments?* Will the non-elect have righteousness and strength in the Lord? If they have, will they not have as much as the elect themselves? This indeed is triumphant testimony; you neither can, nor dare attempt to disprove its validity; even you, ye incensed Calvinists, who colour with indignation at the thought, that *all* men shall be admitted to enjoy the salvation of God, *you shall be ashamed;* for we have the testimony of the King of the whole earth, that he "frustrateth the tokens of the liars, and maketh diviners mad, and turneth wise *men* backward, and maketh *their* knowledge *foolish.*" Isaiah xliv. 25. The word *elect* next occurs in the 65th chap. 9th verse, where Christ, the elect of God, is again alluded to. "And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah, an inheritor of my mountains; and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there." The reader is requested to notice, that the elect, Christ, is mentioned in contradistinction to the servants of God; and the servants of God are mentioned in contradistinction to the Israelites,

who are reproved in the 5th verse, in particular, for their transgression, in the following remarkable words: "Which say, Stand by thyself; come not near to me; FOR I AM HOLIER THAN THOU." These the Lord declares, "*are* a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day." The Israelites considered themselves as the favourites of heaven. They were very fond of "*discriminating grace;*" which should select *them*, to the exclusion of *all* others; and puffed up with conceptions of their own *personal holiness*, the language of their hearts was, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me, for I am holier than thou." How many at this day make great professions of superior sanctity; talk much of their *own* goodness, and the wickedness of *others;* speak of their hopes according to election, or saving grace, and ask, with supercilious complacency, Shall such a man go to heaven? What! shall that man be saved? alluding to some of their neighbours, whom *they* are pleased to think are not so *holy* as themselves. Is not a disposition of this kind, especially if it is often evinced, and the words "*personal holiness, endless misery, finally impenitent, non-elect, and fire and brimstone,*" interspersed in all conversations, and applied to nine-tenths of mankind, a sure passport to theological distinction, and a reputation for exemplary goodness? It is our opinion that the heaven which is to be bought with such trash as this, cannot be very desirable, especially if the buyers carry the disposition there with them, which influenced them during the purchase. The Israelites are, in this 65th chap. of Isaiah, threatened with chastisement for their sins. It is declared that they shall be numbered to the sword, and that the Lord God shall slay them. The destruction here spoken of, we consider to be temporal, and beneficial likewise, to those who were destroyed. We believe that God, "in judgment, remembers mercy." Whoever doubts this, is requested to read the 16th chapter of Ezekiel, from the 40th verse to the end; where God's dealings with the Jews, and with the inhabitants of Sodom and Samaria, is explained in a clear and consolatory manner; and the 37th chapter, if any doubts should remain relative to the Israelites returning to their former estate, will, it is thought, effectually remove them. That part of the 65th chapter of Isaiah, which is included in the 19th verse, to the end of the chapter, has probably exercised the minds and talents of commentators of every sect, as much as any portion of the scriptures; and it is presumed, that very few of them have been able to give satisfaction to their readers, whatever may have been their own sentiments relative to it. We shall give a brief statement of our views of this prophecy; and the reader is requested to make his comment. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, 5th chap. 25th and 26th verses, says, "Jerusalem which now is, is in bondage with her children; but Jerusalem which is above, is the mother of us all." We consider this a figure of the two dispensations, the law, or Mosaic dispensation, and the Gospel dispensation. The new heavens and the new earth, spoken of by Isaiah, are figurative of the Gospel. Paul says that Christ came in the end of the world. The words world and earth, are here convertible terms. In Ephesians, 2d chap. 5th to 7th verses, we read, "Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ; by grace are ye saved; and hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus; that in the *ages* to come, he might show the exceeding riches of his grace, in kindness towards us through Christ Jesus." The word in the original, which is here translated ages, is in other places translated world. Christ came in the end of the *ages*, or Mosaic dispensation, or world; and mankind were quickened with him, being "crucified with him, buried with him, and risen with him, and sit in heavenly places with him." Therefore, the new creation spoken of by the prophet, is the creation in Christ Jesus, agreeable to the Apostle's declaration, "created anew in Christ." See Isaiah, 49th chap. 6th verse to the end of the chapter; where the blessings which result from this new creation are spoken of. We are likewise taught by the Apostle, that "the kingdom of heaven is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." We are also taught that "*Christ is our peace.*" The new heavens, and new earth, spoken of by the prophet, in the 17th verse of the 65th chap. of Isaiah, are mentioned in contradistinction to the old heavens and earth; the old earth being a convertible term with, or, more properly, synonymous with the *ages*, or *world*, which is designated by the Mosaic dispensation, or shadow of good things, as the law is called. And the old heaven, which was the Jewish worship, and consisted of types; and as the worship was typical, so was the peace, or righteousness, or joy, which proceeded from that worship, but a shadow, compared with the worship, which is in spirit and in truth, agreeable to our Saviour's exposition to the woman of Samaria, recorded in the 4th chapter of John, 23d verse. Heaven is considered to be the habitation of the glory of God. And it is in Christ that the seed of Israel shall be justified, and shall glory. The frequent recurrence of the words earth and world, in the scriptures, where the earth and world are called upon to rejoice, &c. make it evident, that mankind are included in, associated with, and are the ostensible objects, or *things;* for men are designated by this word in scripture, who are meant and referred to, when the word world, or earth, is used. The declarations of the Apostle are in unison with, and confirm the testimony of the prophets; and the testimony of Jesus, which is emphatically called the spirit of prophecy, and which declares, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." Paul testifies that our old man is crucified with Christ;" see Romans, 6th chap. 6th verse. Therefore as the old man is the old earth, and as Christ drew all men unto him, all the old earth is destroyed; crucifying being destruction; and all having risen with him, all are made a new earth, or "created anew in Christ Jesus." For, "He was delivered for our offences, and rose again for our justification. Therefore, being justified, by faith," or the knowledge of the fact, that we are justified, "we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." The reader is requested to note, that the peace here spoken of proceeds from knowledge. Peace is a figurative expression to denote heaven. Christ is the heaven alluded to, and when men believe that they are created anew, a spiritual generation, in heaven, or Christ, then they are no longer in infancy or ignorance; and may be considered to have filled their days. The word filled, is a figurative expression for ended. If any thing is full, the work of filling is done; so when a man has filled his days, he has numbered his days; he dies. Paul accordingly speaks of "dying unto sin, and living unto righteousness;" consequently this must be considered in the same figurative sense, and when a man ceases to be an unbeliever, he has filled and numbered his days of unbelief, and dies as an unbeliever, and emphatically so, believing that he was crucified with Christ, and died with him, and arose with him to a spiritual life, agreeable to the declaration, "If one died for all, then were all dead." Or, as it has been more properly rendered, "*then all died;*" 2d Cor. 5th chap. 14th verse. With this view of the subject, and we think we can prove it to be the *only true one*, the 20th verse of this chapter is as clear as the noonday sun. "There shall be no more thence an infant of days." *Quest.* Whence? *Ans.* In the new heavens, which is Christ. There shall be no more in Christ an infant of days. See Ephes. 4th chap. 13th and 14th verses. "Until we all come in the unity of the faith," or to be of one faith, "and of the Son of God, unto a perfect man," or to know that we are in Christ perfect, "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine," &c. Why should we no longer consider ourselves as children? *Ans.* Because we are perfect, in Christ, unto the measure of the fulness of the stature of Christ. What is the measure of the stature of Christ? *Ans.* It is the "fulness of all things;" for "God hath poured out his Spirit upon him without measure." We now see there can "be no more, thence, or in Christ, an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days." Let his natural life be of what number of days it may, he knows that his spiritual days are full, and his stature perfect; but in Christ, not in himself; but in the new heavens. "For the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner an hundred years old shall be accursed." We consider the words child, sinner, die, and cursed, as put in contradistinction, and explanatory, one of the other. The word *child* is figurative of *believer; die,* of our knowledge of being *quickened* in, and with Christ, agreeable to Paul's declaration, "that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." And the believer, knowing that he died, and was quickened together with Christ, if he dies in childhood, he dies mature in knowledge, and of the full age and stature of the perfect man. The *sinner* is the *unbeliever* in this truth; he knows of no life, or heaven, but the natural life, and the natural joys which proceed from himself; his Christ is the measure and perfection of his own faith, and his own righteousness is the measure of the stature of his life, and the ghostly shadow or phantom of his perfection. Whatever may be his age, whether his cheek glows with the ruddy countenance of youth, or is furrowed by the hand of time, and his locks silvered with the blasts of an hundred winters, he has no knowledge, but the delusive teachings of a hope, false as his faith; and no confidence, but the uncertain and perishing heaven of his own creation. He is, therefore, cursed, or rejected, his faith not being the faith of Christ; he is an old man, but not in Christ; therefore he has not filled his days, but is adding day after day of unbelief, until the measure of his

depravity is completed, and his consciousness of being cursed by the law, on the fulfilment of which he placed his hopes, produces its concomitants, doubt, fear, and torment. Therefore, he is conscious that *he* is *rejected*, or *cursed*. This chapter, or prophecy, is highly figurative. It is written in an allegorical style, which, of all others, is distinguished for comparison and comprehension. The parables of our Saviour are allegorically, historically, and prophetically true. As allegories, they contain the strongest comparative reasoning. As history, they portray, in the strongest and truest colours, the features of character, motives to action, and principles of conduct, which have, and continue to indentify man in all his relative conditions and concerns, whether we consider him in the social, religious, or political world. They are prophecy; for "the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy." It was this Spirit which kindled the fire of devotion in the hearts, and illumed the understandings of the prophets, and unlocked the door of futurity to man. Considering this prophecy as the *words* of Christ, and that "He spake as man never spake," we not only regard it as our imperious duty, but as a pleasure, to be guided by him, in our investigation of this momentous subject. He, when on earth, declared, "the *words* that I speak unto you, *they* are *Spirit*, and *they* are *life*." And we are further instructed, that when God created man, "He breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a *living soul*." Life, light, and immortality, are the gifts of heaven. Death, darkness and mortality, are the work of man; "for by man came death." The new *creation* spoken of by the prophet, is a return from *death* unto *life*; from weakness, corruption, dishonour, and mortality—to strength, incorruption, glory, and immortality, or eternal life, in and through our *Head* and Saviour, Jesus Christ. We, therefore, believe the *prophecy* in *question* to be spirit and life. Not the spirit of destruction, conjuring, from the black abodes of darkness and unbelief, the ghostly phantoms of *death* and *damnation!* Not a life, which is a forced existence, whose every moment is big with HORROR, and whose every hope is maddened with DISTRACTION!—but the spirit of love; that LOVE, which far transcends the humble capacity of mortals to define; and which shall *glow* with the pure *flame* of Omnipotent *affection*, like that which crimsoned the CROSS on CALVARY with the BLOOD OF HEAVEN, when *time* shall be swallowed up in ETERNITY, and ETERNITY immerged in the OCEAN OF OMNIPOTENCE!—and a *life*, quickened with the creative *breath* of Deity, renewed with celestial energies, whose conceptions shall equal the lightning's glance, rival eternity in duration, and repose in their *centre* and *origin*, the BOSOM OF GOD.

(*To be continued.*)

COMMUNICATIONS.

On the Testimony of Prophecy, in regard to the Divine Person and Character of Jesus Christ.

(*Continued from page* 19.)

He was acquainted with the thoughts of those with whom he conversed, so as to know their most secret purposes, intentions, and designs. John ii. 25. Matt. xii. 25. Luke v. 22. chap. vi. 8. chap. ix. 47. chap xi. 17.

I am well aware that the Unitarians, or Socinians, conscious of the divine agency manifested in the above cases, and that none but God could work such wonders, are willing to allow them to be the works of God; but then, say they, Jesus Christ was a mere instrument in performing the miracles wrought with him in Egypt, and whilst he was conducting the children of Israel through the wilderness. Jesus Christ, therefore, they contend, had only a deputed divine power, like Moses, but not any proper divine power of his own, and thus he was as much a mere man, as Moses, and no more a real God, than that leader of Israel.

On this question, then, the whole of the argument turns:—Did Jesus Christ act merely by a derived divine power, or from his own proper divine power? In other words, was he merely a subordinate agent, or a principal? An instrument in the hands of the Supreme God, or the Supreme God himself, existing and acting solely from himself? On this one point, I say the whole of the dispute turns, respecting the divinity of the great Saviour, and therefore we have only to make this single inquiry; whether he acted by deputation from another, or by a self-possessed divine authority? In order to ascertain the truth, and since this question can never be so well decided as by the testimony of that great Saviour himself, may I entreat your further patience, whilst I endeavour, *secondly*, to prove, from the words of that Saviour, that the power from which he acted was his own, and not another's, and consequently that he was the Supreme God over all, blessed for ever, self-existing, and self-operating.

The first testimony, to which I shall call your attention on this occasion, is to be found in the evangelist John, chap. v. 21. where are these words: "As the Father raiseth up "the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the "Son quickeneth whom he will." Now, by the SON, we know, is here meant the HUMANITY, which was conceived by the power of the Highest in the womb of the Virgin Mary; and of which it is written, That holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God. This humanity, as we have already shown, was at first an infirm humanity; but in proportion as the infirmities derived from the mother were put off, it became glorified, or a divine humanity, being incorporated with the fulness of the Deity, agreeable to the declaration of St. Paul, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. ii. 9. Now what I would contend for, on this occasion, is, that the whole of divinity was transferred to this humanity, and this in such manner, they finally became one, so that the humanity acted from itself, and not by deputation from the divinity. For how else could it be said, Even so the Son of God quickeneth whom he will? If the Son here spoken of, had acted solely from a deputed authority, it would surely have been the most arrogant presumption in him to adopt this language, and to compare his agency with the Father's, from which he derived it. For what should we think of a person, commissioned by the Almighty to communicate some extraordinary blessing, who should fulfil his commission by saying, I bless whom I will? Should we not say, and say justly, that this was a strange and unwarranted abuse of his authority, and that he ought rather to have said, I bless whom the Almighty willeth?

But further, it is written in the 26th verse of the same chapter, "As the Father hath life in himself, even so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." But what shall we say is to be understood by the Father having life in himself? Can it properly mean any thing else, than that the Father hath a self-possessed, underived life of his own, completely independent of every other being whatsoever? When the same expression then is applied to the Son, and he also is said to have life in himself, are we not forced to say, that he also hath a self-possessed, underived life of his own, completely independent of any other being whatsoever? Yet how could this be, unless the Father had transferred to the Son his divine humanity, his own self-possessed, underived life? For it must be plain to every reflecting mind, that there can be but one self-possessed, underived life, in the universe, and therefore if the Son, or divine humanity, called this life his own, it could only be in consequence of its being transferred to him from the Father. But if the Father transferred to the Son his own self-possessed, underived life, he must of necessity also transfer to him the whole of his Godhead; for what is the Godhead, properly speaking, but self-possessed, underived life?

Again, it is written in the 23d verse of the same chapter, "that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father." But let me ask, how is it that men may be supposed to honour the Father? Can it be in any other manner, than by making him the supreme object of their worship and adoration, and thus by ascribing to his divine mercy, wisdom, and power, all that they are, or have, or can be? This, I say, is the measure, and the only just measure, of the honour due to the eternal Father. This then is the measure, and the only just measure, of the honour due unto the Son, or divine humanity, and consequently he, like the Father, is to be accounted the Supreme object of worship and adoration, and we are to ascribe to his divine mercy, wisdom, and power, all that we are, or have, or can be. But it is absolutely impossible there can be two Supreme objects of worship and adoration, or two divine sources of all that we are, or can be. We are therefore again compelled to conclude, that it is the will of the eternal Father, that all worship and adoration should be transferred from himself to the Son, or divine humanity, and consequently that to the Son, or divine humanity, he has transferred the whole of his Godhead.

Again, Jesus Christ says to the unbelieving Jews, "If ye believe not that I Am, ye shall die in your sins." John viii. 24. You will here be pleased to note, that Jesus Christ does not assert, that unless we believe in his doctrine, we shall die in our sins, but he says expressly, *if ye believe not that I Am.* And what shall we say is involved in the expression I AM? Surely nothing less can be intended by it, than to teach us he is the Supreme God, or Jehovah, since he here assumes the same sacred name by which the Supreme God, or Jehovah, was distinguished in the Old Testament; for according to any other view of the subject, what could it signify to the Jews to believe that he is? They saw him plainly in a human form before their eyes, and must, of course, believe him to be a man. This belief, therefore, in his manhood, or mere human

nature, could never be meant by Jesus Christ, when he said, *If you believe not that I am, ye shall die in your sins.* We see then, again, in this instance, how Jesus is always indentifying himself with Jehovah, as likewise in that other passage, where he says to the Jews, "*Before Abraham was, I am.*" John viii. 58.

Again, Jesus Christ himself declares, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all unto me;" John xii. 32.; in which word, two things are remarkable, and deserve consideration; *first*, that Jesus Christ draws all; *secondly*, that he draws all unto himself. Now, he had before said, "No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him." John vi. 44. It is plain, therefore, that the power of *drawing* was now transferred from the Father to the divine humanity of Jesus Christ, for the Father, we learn, had before exercised this power, and had drawn all unto the Son; but now the Son, or divine humanity, exercises it, and draws all unto himself. Can any conclusion then be plainer, than that the power of drawing was now transferred from the Father to the Son, or divine humanity? But what, let me ask, was this power of drawing, or in what did it consist? Could it be any thing else but the *attraction of the divine mercy and love*, and could it consist in any thing else? For what else is attractive in the Godhead, but this Godlike principle of his mercy and love? It is plain, then, that when this power of *drawing* was transferred to the divine humanity of Jesus Christ, all the *mercy and love of the Godhead* was transferred to him, in which that power originates. But if the divine mercy and love of the Godhead was transferred to Him, the Godhead himself must be transferred; for what is the Godhead but his divine mercy and love? Besides, Jesus Christ says, "I will draw all unto me." But why draw unto himself, unless the whole of the Godhead, called the Father, had been contained in himself? For had the Father been out of himself, *or separate from* himself, he would surely have said, I will draw all unto the Father, since that was the great end of his coming into the world, to call mankind back again to the Father. In declaring then that he would *draw all unto himself*, he proclaims aloud to the whole world, with irresistible evidence, that the Father and he were one; in other words, that the entire Godhead, called the Father, was transferred to, and united with, the divine humanity which he had assumed. To the same purpose, and for the same reason, this divine humanity saith, in another place, *Come unto me;* Matt. xi. 28.; *abide in me; without me ye can do nothing;* John xv. 4, 5. which could not have been said, without the highest degree of presumption, had not all the fulness of the Father been incorporated in that humanity.

But I have not yet done with my argument on this interesting and inexhaustible subject; for in the eleventh chapter of the evangelist John, verses 25, 26, we hear Jesus Christ consoling Martha, the sister of the dead Lazarus, in these words: "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." In these words Jesus Christ calls himself, expressly, the resurrection and the life. Observe, he does not say that he confers resurrection and life, by virtue of a power deputed from another, but he declares, without reserve, that that power is his own, and, indeed, that it is himself, for what else can the words mean, "I am the resurrection and the life?"

(To be Continued.)

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

(Concluded.)

I cannot close these few remarks, without cautioning brethren in the ministry against the indulgence of that spirit of railing, which was manifested in language recently heard from a pulpit, "that the Universalists were as cunning and artful as the devil; and classing them with Deists and Atheists, warned his hearers against listening to their awful perversion of scripture, which, he said, was plausible and dangerously deceptive." Is this giving an answer with meekness and fear? Take care lest you be found fighting against God, and so fall under the many and deeply afflicting stripes, that they who know their Master's will, and do it not, must expect to feel. In a future communication, I shall notice some expressions from another pulpit in this city, but with a different spirit, I hope, from that which produced the expressions, provided he does not refrain from the indulgence of them. I hope, however, he will reflect, and desist. In the mean time, I would caution him against the promulgation of the monstrous absurdity he has advanced from his pulpit, namely, that those whom he considers the non-elect, were brought into existence by the agency of the devil, and so of right belong to him as their father; neither is there any hope held out to them in the Gospel, although the Author of it directed it to be preached to every creature. Consider yourself in the presence of your Maker, your awful responsibility, and see that you first cast the beam out of your own eye, and then attend to the mote in your brother's eye.

A few serious and important questions shall close this communication. In Matthew, 5th chap. 44th and 45th verses, we are commanded to love our enemies, bless them that curse us, do good to them that hate us, and pray for them which despitefully use us and persecute us; "that we may be the children of our Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Are we not commanded, thus, to love and bless our enemies, because our heavenly Father doth love and bless his enemies? And whom he doth love and bless, will he not love and bless to the end? And do not those who teach that God loves *none* but those who love *him*, reduce *him* to a level with the publican? If the Father hath given to Christ the "heathen his inheritance," and "the uttermost parts of the earth his possession;" Psalm 2d and 8th, and hath appointed him heir of all things, Heb. 1 and 2. and if he hath through death destroyed him that had the power of death, will not Christ, according to his promise, raise them up at the last day? John 6th, 39th. If *all* who *die* in Adam shall be made *alive* in Christ, at the resurrection morning, must not the very same *all* have *slept* in Christ? and if they have *all* slept, and shall *all* awake in Christ, will not He who sitteth in the heavens laugh, and the Almighty have in derision, the *impotent*, though united efforts of men, and devils, to separate them from Him, or from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus? And lastly, does not the disposition, which is at present so manifest in the religious world, to resist such a host of testimony, to refuse credence to such a cloud of witnesses as the Scriptures present in favour of all men, evince the very same spirit, that rankled in the bosoms of those, who thought themselves the peculiar favourites of heaven, and who said, "Stand by, for I am holier than thou?"

INQUIRER.

MR. EDITOR,—

Perceiving that my communication was not concluded in your last Number, I thought proper to forward you the above questions; an answer to which is respectfully solicited from those whose duty it is, as public teachers, to "try all things, and prove all things."

Remarkable instance of Hyperbole.

We recently saw a pamphlet, purporting to be a sermon, entitled, "*The last great assize, or day of Jubilee.*" The *author* introduces his description of heaven, in the following *original style*: "The moon is more glorious than our sun, and the sun as glorious as he that made it, &c. A new *earth*, where all the *waters* are *milk*, and all their *milk honey*. Where all their *grass* is *corn*, and all their *corn manna*. Where all their *glebe* is *gold*, and their *gold* innumerable *carats*. Where all their *minutes* are *ages*, and all their *ages eternity*." And concludes by saying, "Of these new heavens, and new earth, we can only say, *that we can say* NOTHING." It is but justice to this Rev. AUTHOR, to say, that his description of HELL, and the punishment of sinners, was in as *correct style*, and as *reasonable* as his description of "the new *heavens* and new *earth*." "I have heard of a preacher, who, desirous to appear very profound, and to make remarks on the commonest subjects, which had never occurred to any body before, remarked, as an instance of the goodness of Providence, that the moments of time come successively, and not simultaneously or together, which last method of coming would, he said, occasion infinite confusion in the world."

'Who is a liar, but he who denieth that Jesus is the Christ?'

*** A Clergyman, on Sunday last, declared, from the pulpit, "The doctrine, that Christ *died for all men*, is a *damnable doctrine*." A gentleman to whom this was related, observed, "The scriptures declare, that *Christ tasted death for every man*, and is the *Saviour of all men*. Therefore, there is a *damnable lie* between the clergyman and the scriptures." Reader, to which does it belong? Let *God be true*, and this clergyman a LIAR!

John, 1st Epistle, 2d chap. 2d verse: "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for *the sins of* the WHOLE WORLD!"

To Correspondents.

A communication, on theatrical exhibitions, &c. is received. The writer, by examining our prospectus, will be satisfied that it is inadmissible. Philotheus is received, and shall be published, and his queries considered, and objections answered, in our next number.

All Communications forwarded to the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD-STREET.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 17, 1820. NO. 9.

The purposes of God are revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(*Continued.*)

Looking unto Jesus, "the author and finisher of our faith," for instruction, we are informed by his counsel, which cannot err, and which promises *in him* eternal life. "Verily, *I say unto you*, the hour is coming, and now is, when the *dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God; AND THEY THAT HEAR SHALL LIVE! I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in me, though he were DEAD, yet shall he LIVE! And whosoever *liveth* and believeth in me, shall never die! *Believest thou this?*" John, 5th chap. 25th verse, and 11th chap. 25th and 26th verses. It is not possible to conceive of language more full, comprehensive, and consolatory than this, the declarations of the God of the whole earth. Shall we, wedded to the orthodox errors of the day, and *frightened* at the impotent denunciations of the numerous, but insignificant schemers and visionaries, whose anathemas are but the vapours of erroneous imaginations and dark delusions, which have chained them in *dignified* ignorance, and wrapped them in the misty garb of sectarian folly and extravagance, and intrenched them behind the clamorous railing accusations of the multitude, shall this excite fear, retard investigation, or prevent belief of the truth of God, revealed from heaven by his Son, the Saviour of the world? God forbid; If Baal be God, hear him. But if the Lord be God, hear HIM! The testimony we have quoted from the Gospel of John, and which is the words of Christ, to an unprejudiced mind must be perfectly irresistible. It proves, in an incontrovertible manner, the *new heaven* or *creation* in Christ. "They are *spirit*, and they are *life*. The dead shall *hear*, and they that hear shall live." All men were dead in trespasses and sins; all were gone out of the way;" Christ is the way, "and there was none that did good, no, not ONE!" But "the dead shall hear." What shall they hear? *Ans.*—I, Christ, am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." What shall we believe? The answer is given, "Whosoever liveth, and believeth in me shall never die." And in John's First Epistle, 5th chap. "He that believeth not, God hath made him a liar; because he believed not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that GOD HATH GIVEN TO US ETERNAL LIFE, and this *life is in his Son.*" The occasion on which Christ spoke the words which we have quoted, is explanatory of the words; Lazarus was dead, and his lifeless body committed to the grave. His afflicted sister Martha, not understanding the Saviour, who told her that her brother should rise again, answered him, by saying, I know that he shall rise again at the last day The answer of Christ, I am the resurrection, &c. was given as a correction of her error. The raising of Lazarus from the dead, in the manner in which he was raised by Jesus, with a corruptible body, liable to disease and death, was not, nor possibly could be, the resurrection he alluded to, and which is explained by the Apostle in 1 Cor. 15th chap. 4th verse, to be an incorruptible resurrection and change. Christ says, "Because I live, ye shall live also." And Paul has declared that we were crucified with him, and have risen with him. Christ declared, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." All men, therefore, were drawn to Christ; and being members of his body, he the *head*, agreeable to Paul's declaration, "Be it known unto you, that Christ is the head of every man;" they, "*every man, all men*," were "*crucified with him*," for they were "*baptized into his sufferings.*" For "On him was laid the iniquity of us all; he bare our sins in his own body on the tree," which body is all the race of Adam; "for he is the *head* of *every man*, *we* are the *members* of *his body*, of *his flesh*, and of *his bones*. If *one* died for *all!* then were *all dead*, or *all died.*" Consequently, the resurrection spoken of by Jesus was the resurrection of *his body* And Lazarus being a member of that body, he rose with Christ. And he that *liveth* and believeth that he rose with Christ, "will never die, for he has passed from death unto life, and shall not come into condemnation." On such the death of the body has no power; they know that it is but the throwing off the cumbrous garment of mortality, and the opening the door to heaven. The unbeliever in this truth is morally dead, and is condemned for not believing that he is alive in Christ; which unbelief constitutes his moral death. And if he is physically, and naturally dead, as was Lazarus, the time is coming when he shall hear, believe, and live. "For the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear, and they that hear shall live." And the apostle to the Corinthians, 15th chap. 49th verse, says, "And as we have borne the image of the *earthy*," or Adam, "we shall bear the image of the heavenly," or Christ. The natural death of the body is not the consequence of unbelief in Christ, neither is it avoided by believing. "Death hath passed upon all men, for all have sinned." Neither does the natural death of the body incapacitate a man from believing; for it is not the body which believes, any more than it is the shoes which a man wears upon his feet; for the one is as capable of believing as the other. Neither was Lazarus a believer in Christ, previous to his death; neither was his restoration to life a resurrection; for it is Christ who is the resurrection and the life, and the resurrection Christ spoke of was spiritual, not natural; it was in Christ, not in a man's own self individually. In fine, there was not *one* of all Christ's disciples, or followers, who believed in him until after his resurrection from the dead. This can never be controverted. Therefore, "all men are the members of Christ's body; he is the head of every man; all men were drawn unto him, and crucified with him, and buried with him, and have risen with him, and are created anew in Christ." THIS IS TRUTH! AND WE CHALLENGE EVERY CREATED BEING IN THE UNIVERSE, TO PROVE TO THE CONTRARY! We have seen, by the concurring testimony of Scripture, that the *new creation* spoken of by the prophet, is in Christ. All who believe this, rejoice in Christ, and there is no more in Christ "an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days; for the child shall die an hundred years old, but the sinner an hundred years old, shall be accursed." The following verse is explanatory of the blessings which result to those who believe in Christ. See Isaiah, 65th chap. 21st verse. "And they shall build houses and inhabit; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them." The Israelites, on account of disobedience, were visited with temporal sufferings, which are explained in Deuteronomy, 28th chapter. And the figure in the text quoted, is placed in opposition, or contrast, to the sufferings and deprivations of the Israelites, as the succeeding verse explains, by saying, "They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat." We consider this as figurative of the fulness of those who believe in Christ, and expressive of spiritual blessings in him; and the joy which is consequent upon believing, is expressed by the figure of "the work of their hands;" for it is said in this verse, "As the days of a tree, *are* the days of my people." We consider this *tree* as figurative of Christ; who is described in the Scriptures as a "green tree," and it is added, "From me is thy fruit found." In this 22d verse, it is said, "Mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands." Explanatory of this is the declaration to Christ, "who for the joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame," &c.; and Christ is the elect alluded to in this 22d verse. See 23d verse; "They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they, the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them." See 9th verse of this chapter. "And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains; and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there." In the preceding verse, the 8th, the Israelites are compared to a "cluster of grapes, and *one* saith, Destroy it not, for a blessing *is* in it; so will I do for my servants sakes, that I may not destroy them all." Is there a part of God's servants who are to be destroyed? See 9th verse, "And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob," &c. Is not this seed Christ? Is not he the blessing which is illustrated under the figure of a cluster of grapes? Is it not Christ who is the seed of the woman, and in whom all the families of the earth are

blessed? And did Christ come out of Judah, and will he not inherit all things? It is not possible to reconcile these two verses in any other way, than to consider Christ the elect spoken of in the 9th verse; for the elect shall inherit *it*, in the *singular;* and in the 8th verse, the cluster of grapes, which is the figure of all the Jews without distinction, is mentioned in the *singular* likewise; but in the 9th verse, the word *mountains* is *plural;* and the elect, *Christ*, shall inherit *it*, the cluster of grapes, or all the people; and "my servants," in the *plural*, shall dwell *there*, in "the *mountains*," *plural*. The word *seed*, in this 9th verse, is put parallel with the blessing in the 8th verse, and is in both places figurative of Christ. This view of the subject, and we believe it is the true one, shows the harmony of the Scriptures. We now see the consistency of the prophet, who declares, speaking of Christ, that the heathen is his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth his possession. It is said in the 23d verse, "They shall not labour in vain," &c. The 24th verse explains what that labour is; "And it shall come to pass, that before they call I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear." The answer of peace, was given on Calvary, and God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself; his ear is open to the cry of all his creatures, and not one shall speak in vain. 25th verse. "And the wolf and lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock; and dust *shall be* the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord." The construction generally put upon this verse, shows the limited and scanty views which are by many entertained of the kingdom of Christ. Like the Jews, who expected a temporal Saviour, and looked for temporal blessings only, they look for a day which shall be distinguished by the beasts of the field, changing their diet, losing their ferocity, and producing, by this change in *their* dispositions, a temporal convenience and security to man. The ferocious, blood-thirsty wolf, is distinguished for cruelty, and is the perfect contrast to the lamb. The ferocious, blood-thirsty, and cruel Jews, were the perfect contrast to the Lamb of God; "whom they slew, and *nailed* on a *tree*." And, strange metamorphosis, they shall feed with him, and drink water out of the wells of salvation. The *lion*, who reigns tyrant of the forest, and oppresses and destroys the weak, is the greatest contrast to the ox, whose disposition is gentle, easy to be entreated, and whose food is procured without the destruction of the life of any creature. The Jews were the lions of oppression, and the tyrants of the Gentiles; universal dominion was their object, a sovereignty marked by destruction. But they shall be changed, and it shall be their meat and drink to do the will of their heavenly Father; and, like the ox, to "know their owner, and their master's crib." The disposition of the Jews is the disposition of all men, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. But "in the dispensation of the fulness of times, God will put his law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and he will be their God, and they shall be his people. Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls salvation, and thy gates praise. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatlings together; and a little child, Christ, shall lead them. They shall not hurt, nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." The serpent, who is the devil, is here consigned to destruction. It is declared, "and dust *shall be* the serpent's meat." The Scriptures instruct us that "the wages of sin is death." And it was denounced, as the consequence of sin, "dust thou art; and unto dust thou shalt return." And Christ was manifested, to "destroy death, and him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." And, wonderful to relate, he was to effect this, "*through death.*" It was pronounced by the Creator, when that old serpent the devil, deceived the mother of mankind, and pronounced for his *destruction*, "*dust* shalt thou *eat*." The "wages of sin—dust, and death," shall be his meat—and his food, his poison and destruction. This is the fate of the *deceiver*. But the *deceived* shall rise triumphant from the ashes of the fall; shall, in the person of their Head, carry captivity captive,—every enemy to their peace shall be destroyed,—loud hallelujahs shall reverberate to the remotest borders of creation, and the wide universe echo the triumphant song, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, or Hell! where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law, but thanks be to GOD, who giveth us the victory through our LORD JESUS CHRIST."

(To be Continued.)

CONTROVERSIAL.

COMMUNICATION.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Is salvation by the first and outward, or by the second and inward coming of Jesus Christ? Was the first coming under the law, a type of the second, under the ministration of the Spirit? If it is answered in the affirmative, the prophecy of Daniel, chap. ix. 24, is intelligible; for as the outward law by Moses, with all its outward types, sins and transgressions, was finished and ended, when the flesh of Jesus (which was the type that shadowed his divinity) died on the cross;—so the spiritual and internal advent of Jesus Christ begotten in regenerated men, finishes transgression, makes an end of sin, reconciles and atones for iniquity, and brings in heaven or everlasting righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. But if the question is answered negatively, and it is said, Christ's first and typical coming put *an end to the sins of men;* I answer, did his first celebrated advent put an end to sin and transgression? Do we not see mankind sinning daily, as grievously as ever? If sin was ended, death would cease.

I am a candid inquirer after truth; I am no bigot; and I esteem the candour and the liberality expressed in the prospectus to the Gospel Herald, and accordingly expect the Editor will insert and reply to my inquiries, which I believe will be gratifying to many of his readers. I also inquire, what he means, when he says in his prospectus, "Jesus Christ is our Captain, our only Counsellor, Pattern, and Guide;" and that Antichrist, in all the protean forms he may assume, is our only enemy." Jesus Christ is in all those who are not reprobates, their Captain, Counsellor, and Guide; their wisdom righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. He is, then, their light, life, rule and law; and this law is "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and frees (and is the only thing that liberates) us from the law of sin and death." Is such the signification of the expressions of the Editor? If so, then the same Spirit of Jesus Christ in us that quickens, does in all who receive and obey it, regenerate, *redeem* and *save* them, when it comes a second time without sin to salvation. Then this Spirit is "the grace of God that brings salvation, which appears unto all men;" and is Christ the *light, which enlighteneth every man that comes into the world.* And every one who obeys this light, or walks in it, become the children of the light, and are not under condemnation. For the world is condemned for nothing but disobedience to the light, or grieving the holy "*Spirit, which is given to every man to profit him.*" The light of Christ is that which makes our sins manifest to us; and gives power at the same time to cease from them, that we may learn to do well. "Whatsoever makes manifest is light." This light is the truth, or Spirit of God, or blood of Jesus Christ, of which, if we drink not, we have no life in us; and a sprinkling of this blood cleanses the conscience from dead works, and from sin. The washing, or baptism of regeneration, is a washing baptism, or birth of the Spirit of Christ, who is the only way, truth, life, and door unto the Father. He may be found by every man that comes into the world, and is the only gate into the kingdom of heaven, within which consists righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. As his kingdom is spiritual, so this gate is spiritual, and the Sun of Righteousness that shines on his subjects, is spiritual, and warms, as well as enlightens us. All these things, and many more, may be brought to prove that he, who is the Captain, Lord, King, Saviour, Counsellor, Prophet, Priest, Pattern and Guide, &c. is not far off from any of us; and may be found, yes, must be discovered in us, whether for salvation, communion, or union.

If the intention of the Editor is to promulgate such truths as these, I rejoice, and desire he may follow this Guide, in the regeneration; and follow this Captain in the war against Antichrist. Who is Antichrist? He is an Antichrist who denies the preceding doctrines; or denies that it is necessary that Jesus Christ should come and dwell in us, and be manifest in our flesh by his Spirit. "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ *is come* in the flesh;" of his people, who know nothing of the birth of God in them; and who remain still in Adam the first. These are Antichrists, agreeable to John's 2d epistle. But every man, who is born of the word of God, which lives and abides for ever, and who has the Spirit of God, that confesses that Jesus Christ is come in his flesh, is a Christian and of God. He has come out of Adam, Cain, Ishmael, Esau, and Saul, into Christ, the second Adam, and Lord from heaven, in whom all are made alive with Abel, Isaac, Jacob, and David, types of the second or Divine nature. "In the first Adam, or Antichristian nature, we all die; but in the second, or Christian spirit, we are all made alive." This last is the new birth; and "except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," nor be a Christian.

Calvinists have believed, that by the first great manifestation of God, in the flesh of the Virgin Mary, and by the sufferings and crucifixion of Jesus, atonement was made to God by the innocent one, who suffered for, and *instead* of the guilty, a certain elect few, for whom only Christ died. But Universalists have carried Calvinistic salvation, by the outward birth, life, sufferings, and death of Christ, to an universal extent; declaring, that "*Jesus Christ tasted death for every man,*" and atoned on the cross for the sin of all. *For*, every man, is not *instead* of every man; if *for* meant *instead* of, no man could ever die; Christ having tasted death *instead* of all mankind. Deists note this; you who accuse God of punishing his innocent Son, *instead* of guilty man. Christ died *for* man, but not *instead* of man.

If the Calvinists are wrong for looking to the outward and typical coming of the Messiah, for the salvation of an elect few, are not the Universalists in the same kind of error, for expecting the salvation of all, through the outward and typical advent of the Son of God? For it has been shown above, that salvation is not in this outward manner, which was a type; but in an inward power,* by the antitype and only Saviour, God.

I wish the Editor, who has Jesus, this only Saviour, in him, if he is a Christian, as his Captain, Counsellor, and Guide, would illucidate this topic, and oppose under his Captain, the antichristian doctrine, which denies that Jesus Christ must come as a new birth in our flesh, by his Spirit, a second time for our salvation. The Jews, expecting an external Messiah, were cut off; and they, who are depending on an outward sacrifice and atonement for sin, are, as I believe, in the same outward error of the Jews; and liable to condemnation with them. Let this, therefore, be a warning to Calvinists, Universalians, and all others, that see the truth of it.

With respectful esteem to the Editor,
I subscribe,
PHILOTHEUS.

REMARKS.

In replying to our correspondent, we trust we shall be justified in reposing unlimited confidence in the declarations of the Scriptures, and in giving a decided preference to the expositions of Christ, to his own sayings, and to the expositions of his Apostles, to their own declarations. Aware, however, that the candour manifested by our correspondent demands a corresponding disposition on our part, this important inquiry shall be conducted in the spirit of meekness; for we had much rather be convinced of our errors, than cover them with a sophistical robe, even if it were pulled from the back of an opponent. This *communication* embraces one very important and leading feature of doctrine, on which the whole subject under discussion must turn; *namely*, the *Atonement*. The nature of the atonement explained, and its extent proved, would, in fact, if not in form, answer all the queries of our correspondent. But as the form and arrangement of his interrogatives and queries, are rather general than particular; and as the "doctrine of atonement will come before us in order, in our discussion of the "*purposes of God, as revealed in the Scriptures,*" our consideration of it at present will be limited, and our remarks be made in the order in which our correspondent has arranged the matter, which has occasioned them. We shall answer the first interrogatory, "*Is salvation by the first and outward, or by the second and inward coming of Jesus Christ?*" by giving our Saviour's own words in evidence. The question, however, is improperly stated. It should have been, *was* salvation? &c. Or *is it* by the second coming, &c? Our correspondent's remarks relative to Calvinists and Universalists, justifies this *criticism*. And we will take the liberty to remark, in this place, that there is a material difference between the *salvation* spoken of, and the simple fact of our coming to the knowledge that we are the subjects of it. The question is, in fact, nothing more nor less than this: *Was* mankind saved by Christ, when he came in *the flesh?* Or will mankind be saved *posterior* to that event and coming, by the operation of his Spirit, in regenerating them in *their flesh?* Our motive for this arrangement is not to forestall our correspondent; it is simply for the sake of perspicuity, and we trust it will meet with no objection. The declaration of Christ, recorded in the 6th chapter of John's Gospel, 51st and 54th verses, settles this question beyond the possibility of refutation, that mankind were saved by the "first and outward coming of Jesus Christ," the Saviour of the world. "I Am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, shall have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." *Reader*, pause a moment,—are these declarations of Christ true, or false? If they are *true*, they are true *altogether*. And if they are false, they are false *altogether*. Where is the man, who names the name of Christ, who will *dare* put his finger upon a *word* of this passage, and pronounce it a falsehood? There lives not the man!—And strange, passing strange to tell, there are millions who would tremble at the thought of denying a *single* word, who will shut their eyes and deny, in the most aggravated and effectual manner, THE WHOLE! We have remarked, that we should give a decided preference to the expositions of Christ, relative to his own sayings; we shall do this. Christ's first declaration which we have quoted, reads thus,—"*I am the living bread which came down from heaven.*" In the 33d verse of this chapter, Christ says, "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." In the 63d verse, "The words that I speak unto you, are SPIRIT and are LIFE." Is the *spirit* and *life* here spoken of, *damnation* or *salvation?* It is one or the other. This appeal is made to the *conscience* of the *reader*, and WE KNOW that the verdict will be in our favour. It is SALVATION. Who is it for? Christ *answers*, "THE WORLD!" Can any thing be plainer? Have we not the declaration of Christ, that he is the *bread of life;* that he would *give* this bread, or *himself*, for the *life* of the *world?* He did not say, I will sell this bread, but I will give it. In the 12th chapter of John, 47th verse, Christ again testifies of himself, and declares, in the most unequivocal manner, the purpose which he intended to effect by coming into the world. "And if any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, BUT TO SAVE THE WORLD!" Did Christ accomplish the end for which he came? We answer, Yes. And salvation, therefore, "is by the first and outward coming of Jesus Christ. This is as *true*, as the positive declaration of *Christ* himself can make it. Our correspondent asks the *question*, "Was the first coming under the law, a type of the second, under the ministration of the Spirit?" We answer, no,—for if it were admitted, it would be making a *type*, or shadow of the *substance*, which Paul says is Christ. Our correspondent says, "If this is answered in the affirmative, the prophecy of Daniel, 9th chap. 24th verse, is intelligible, &c. This argument is, that sin is not ended, nor transgression finished, until men are regenerated, and Christ begotten in them, in their flesh. And that this second coming atones for, and finishes transgression, &c. It is very surprising that our correspondent did not see the consequence of his premises; for if the sins of men are an insuperable objection to the doctrine, that Christ in his first coming made an end of sin, &c. it is equally so against his doctrine; for as there is not a "man living who doeth good, and sinneth not," the second coming of Christ is as ineffectual as the first, and proved so by our correspondent's own argument. It should never be forgotten for *one* moment, that *we* are "*created anew* IN CHRIST," *not* created anew IN OURSELVES. Our correspondent is requested to turn to Daniel's prophecy again. We think his view of it would, if possible, prove it *false*. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision, and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy." Although the difference among commentators, relative to the term of time meant by the prophet in the seventy weeks, is very small, about ten years, and this circumstance amounting to almost proof, that this prophecy referred exclusively to Christ's first coming, &c. we wave it, and introduce that, which to our conception is perfectly irresistible. This testimony is the united voice of the prophets and apostles. The first thing noted by the prophet to be effected by Christ, the anointed of God, and Most Holy, is to "*finish transgression*, and make an end of sin." The God of the whole earth, speaking by his prophets, says, "I will make a new *covenant* with you, even the sure mercies of David. I will give him, *Christ*, for a covenant to the people. This is the covenant I will make, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their mind, &c. I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins, and their iniquities, will I remember no more. But now ONCE in the end of the world," or ages, or Mosaic dispensation, "hath he, Christ, appeared to PUT AWAY SIN by the *sacrifice* of *himself*. On *Him* was *laid* the iniquities of us all; he bare *our sins* in his own body on the tree; with his stripes we are healed. He was delivered for our offences, and rose again for our justification; therefore being justified, &c. And having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to re-

* Jesus Christ is called the power of God, the wisdom of God, the Word of God, or *Gospel*. Gospel comes from the Saxon words, *God's-spel*, or God's-word, which is Jesus Christ. Hence we see how correctly Paul has defined "Gospel to be the power of God to salvation, to every one that believeth;" but not to them who refuse to believe this divine power, in contradiction to human powers and persuasions.

concile all things unto himself. But this man, after he had offered ONE SACRIFICE for SINS, *for ever* sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting until his enemies be made his footstool. For by ONE OFFERING *he hath* PERFECTED *for ever* them that are sanctified." The next thing mentioned by the prophet, is to "make reconciliation for iniquity;" not to make it possible for mankind to reconcile themselves, or to make reconciliation in their own persons. "God is IN CHRIST, reconciling the world unto himself, *not* imputing *their trespasses* UNTO THEM." This text speaks volumes, and it is shunned by many, as they would shun the most deadly poison. The next declaration of the prophet is, "to bring in everlasting righteousness;" not "*filthy rags*," the righteousness of the creature. "I have sworn by myself; the word is gone out of my mouth, righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength, to him shall come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and prophets, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, UNTO ALL, and *upon all them that believe;* FOR THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE; for *all* have *sinned* and come short of the glory of God. Christ of God is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption." The next thing spoken of by the prophet, is to "seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy." One *question* settles this part of our subject for ever. "Was Christ the anointed of God? We believe there will be no dispute on this question. Therefore, every thing predicted by the prophet was sealed, and finished, when Christ was anointed as the Most Holy. Our correspondent concludes his first paragraph, by saying, "If sin was ended, death would cease." What! do your *regenerated* men live for ever a natural life, and does death cease to feed on them? or is *sin* still "present with them?" The next *quere*, is in the following, where speaking of the Editor, he inquires what he means, when he says in his *prospectus*, "Jesus Christ is our Captain, our only Counsellor, Pattern, and Guide; and that Antichrist, in all the protean forms he may assume, our only enemy." We declare that we meant what we said, without any hesitation, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever. And that all human authorities, when put in competition with Christ, or his word, ought to be of less estimation than "the drop in the bucket." And that every thing that is *not* Christ, nor *for* Christ, we shall consider Antichrist and an *enemy;* and lifting the *standard* of the cross, throw down the *gauntlet*, and proclaim the WAR! Our correspondent declares, that "Jesus Christ is in all those who are not reprobates, their Captain, Counsellor, and Guide; their wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. He is in them, their light, life, rule and law; and this law is the law of the spirit of life *in Christ* Jesus, and frees, and is the only thing that liberates us from the law of sin and death. Is such, he asks, the significations of the Editor? If so, then the same Spirit of Jesus Christ in us, that quickens, does in all who receive and obey it, regenerate, *redeem*, and *save* them, when it comes a second time, without sin to salvation. Then this Spirit is "the grace of God that brings salvation, which appears unto all men;" and is Christ the light, &c." What is it to *quicken*, and when are men quickened? See Ephesians, 2d chap. 4th to 10th verses inclusive. "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ; by grace are ye saved; and hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus; that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace, in *his* kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; *it is* the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God had before ordained that we should walk in them." We consider Paul speaking by the Holy Ghost, or Christ, and this, therefore, is our *counsel*, and we will be advised by it. We are instructed *first*, that we were *loved* by God, and *quickened* together with Christ by him, when we were dead in trespasses and sins. *Quere*, When was Christ quickened, at his first coming? See Peter, 1st epistle, 3d chap. 18th verse, "For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." *Quere*, Did Christ effect his purpose, and bring the unjust to God? Are we not "dead, and our life hid with Christ in God?" Have we not "eternal life in his Son?" We are informed, *second*, that we are raised up with Christ, and sit together in heavenly *places*, in him. *Quere*, When was Christ raised? Was it at his first coming? Hear our *Captain* and Guide, for his counsel is unerring. "Destroy this *temple*, and in three days I will raise it again." Was not the *temple* of his body destroyed? and did he not rise triumphant from the dead?

"Hear, O ye Heavens! hear it, O ye dead!
"He rose; he burst the bars of death,
"And triumph'd o'er the grave."

We are instructed, *third*, that we are saved by the *grace* of God, not by our works, and that it is *through faith*, or by the knowledge of this salvation, that we experience salvation, or know that we are the saved of the Lord, not our own saviours. For we, who "were sometime afar off, are in Christ, being made nigh by his blood," not by our *faith*, or *works*. And, *fourth*, We are instructed that "we are the work of God, *created in* Christ Jesus, unto *good works;*" not *our own good* "*works*, lest we should boast." We believe *Philotheus* was not aware of the consequences which would result from *his* view of *this* subject. He speaks of the Spirit of God coming the *second* time, without SIN unto *salvation*. Did the Spirit of God come the first time with SIN unto *damnation*? Have not we the testimony of Christ, that he "came not to *judge* the world, but to *save* the world?" *Philotheus* has quoted the 11th verse of Paul's 2d chapter, in his epistle to Titus. The translation is WRONG! It reads in the original, "For the grace of God, that bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared." Compare this with the declaration of the same apostle to the Ephesians, 1st chap. 9th and 10th verses. It is the *grace of God* which hath appeared to Paul, and others who believe with Paul, the glorious truth, that all men are "created anew in Christ," and saved agreeable to God's will. We *agree* with *Philotheus*, that the Spirit of Christ is not in those who are of a reprobate mind, and are *reprobates*. And we should be gratified if he would *agree* with us, that these *reprobates* are *in Christ*, created anew, and reconciled *in him;* and for this reason, that these reprobates were in Christ, when Christ was "lifted up from the earth, and drew all men unto him;" and they were regenerated in him, being *created anew* in him; and "were *crucified* with *him;* and *buried* with *him;* and have *risen* with *him;* and *sit in* heavenly places *in* Christ Jesus." And they are reprobates, because they do not believe these truths, which are taught by our "Captain, Counsellor, Pattern, and Guide!" We believe that Christ is our "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption;" and this knowledge in us produces a belief in the Gospel of Christ our Lord. In fine, we give all the glory to God. Of ourselves we can do nothing; and in ourselves we see nothing but a body of sin and death; and give all the thanks to God, who hath given us the victory through our glorious Lord and Triumphant Head and Saviour, Jesus Christ. We further believe, that "the law of the Spirit of life *in* Christ Jesus," is in Christ Jesus without measure; and that when the time spoken of by the prophet shall come, God will "pour out his Spirit, which is the Spirit of life, upon all flesh." If this Spirit was in *us*, in this life, as it was in Christ, we should be as perfect as Christ was. "But we know, that if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us;" 1st John, 1st chap. 8th verse.

(*To be concluded next week.*)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

'When we are raised from deep distress, our God demands
our song:
We take the pattern of our praise from Hezekiah's* tongue.
The gates of the devouring grave are open'd wide in
vain,
If he that holds the keys of death command them shut
again.
When he but speaks the healing word, then no disease
withstands;
Fevers and plagues obey the Lord, and fly as he commands.
To him I cried—"Thy servant save, thou ever good and
just,
Thy power can rescue from the grave; thy power is all
my trust."'
He heard.—To health—to us restored
The man, who preaches Christ our Lord.

S. K.

* Isaiah xxxix. 9, &c.

To Correspondents.

A communication is received per mail, relative to multiplicity of faiths. J. B. is received; and a communication on vital religion. An answer to our remarks in No. 7, is received, and shall be published.

All Communications forwarded to the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD-STREET.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 24, 1820. NO. 10.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Remarks on Philotheus.

(Continued.)

We believe that "Christ will come the second time, without sin unto salvation;" and we believe that which constituted Christ a sinner, at his first coming, was the sin of the members of his body: "For be it known unto you, that Christ is the head of every man;" and every, or all men being the members of his body, and *on him being laid* the INIQUITIES OF US ALL! Christ appeared with the sins of all men, suspended upon the cross on Calvary, and "tasted death *for* every man." The Head, suffering for the members, and the members, all men, who are the bride, the Lamb's wife, was then and there cleansed from all sin; "for the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin," and were made perfect in Christ their Head; "for he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," and God beholds us in Christ, without spot or blemish. *Philotheus* says, "The light of Christ is that which makes our sins manifest to us, &c.; whatsoever makes manifest is light," &c. The word *manifest*, without one solitary exception, is in Scripture perfectly synonymous with the word *known*. Paul says, "By the law is the knowledge of sin; I had not known sin, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Philotheus says, "Whatsoever *makes* manifest is light." He has marked this as a quotation, and we are of opinion, that it was not quoted from the Scriptures. It is not correct. How *that* which maketh a thing known, can be the thing itself, is to us incomprehensible. John, speaking of himself, said, "He was not the light, but *was sent* to bear witness *of* that *light*, that *was* the true *light*," &c. And John testified of Christ, that he should baptize the Pharisees, whom he called a generation of vipers, "with the Holy Ghost and fire." *Philotheus*, after some general remarks, *observes*, "If the intention of the Editor is to promulgate such truths as these, I rejoice, and desire he may follow this Guide in the regeneration; and follow this Captain, in the war against Antichrist." It is immaterial to us what kind of truths they are which are exhibited, or by whom, if they are only truths; but we have for some time had a predilection in favour of what is contained in the Scriptures, and have considered them as containing the truth. We believe that there cannot be two kinds of truth; the idea of a false truth is somewhat inconsistent with truth. We shall make the Scriptures our text book, and give them the decided preference to all others. We feel it to be our duty to acknowledge, that our correspondent has evinced a sincere desire to obtain the truth, and to reject error; and we have no disposition to charge him, personally, with any errors, but would impute any thing of the kind to the prejudices which take root in the mind of every man, and which "grow with his growth, and strengthen with his strength." *Philotheus* asks, "Who is Antichrist?" and adds, "he is an Antichrist who denies the preceding doctrines; or denies that it is necessary that Jesus Christ should come and dwell in us, and be manifest in our flesh, by his Spirit." We are rather suspicious that we must pass for Antichrist, *if Philotheus'* doctrines are correct in full; but it must first be proved, that they are the doctrines of Christ; then, if we deny them, we are indeed guilty. Some of the declarations of *Philotheus* are rather ambiguous. He declares, that he who "denies that it is necessary that Jesus Christ should come and dwell in us, and be manifest in our flesh, by his Spirit, is Antichrist." It is candidly acknowledged, that we do not understand this; we know the meaning of the words, but we do not know what the writer of them intended we should understand by them. If he meant, by the word *necessary*, that the salvation of the soul could not be effected without this, we deny it in the most unqualified manner imaginable. If by being manifest in the flesh, or *our flesh*, he meant that it was necessary that Christ, or God, should take part of our flesh and blood, and should be manifest, or known, as God reconciling the world unto himself, and that by his own works, and on the cross, at the first appearing of Christ, we subscribe to the doctrine with all our heart, and declare, that he that denieth this, is Antichrist. And what to Philotheus may appear, at least, a little extra-theological, we believe that none but Antichrist will deny, that Christ has already done it. We declare, in the most unqualified manner, that we believe the modern doctrine of regeneration, which declares that men are *created anew* in *themselves*, is the very essence of the doctrine and principles of Antichrist, and has no foundation, either in nature, reason, or revelation, for its support. We believe our *good regenerated men*, can be made a great deal better than they are at present; and that many, very many of their deeds would be a very great disgrace to the wicked unregenerate part of the community; and that even their righteousnesses are far from being libelled, when they are called "*filthy rags*." The Spirit of God does not produce "*filthy rags*." We fear the spirit of the devil, or at least a spirit of no very good origin, is sometimes at the bottom of the matter. Philotheus, in his quotation from John, 2d epistle, 1st chap. 7th verse, has made a small mistake; the words "*of his people*," are not in the Scriptures. See John, 4th chap. of his first Epistle, and 2d and 3d verses. Although Christ has come in the *flesh of his people*, all being his people, see 100th Psalm, "for all were made *by* him, and *for* him," and he took upon him our nature, and "took part of the same *flesh* and *blood*," &c.; still, we cannot avoid asking Philotheus, if he does not deal out damnation with too profuse a hand, when in addition to this, he says, of what he calls the antichristian doctrine, that it "denies that Jesus Christ must come as a new birth, in *our flesh* by his Spirit, a *second* time for *our* salvation." We must believe that he means, that the salvation of men depends upon a regeneration in this life; and this regeneration is effected by Christ's coming the second time, and in our flesh; and all who deny this, are antichristian. We think Paul preached a little different from this doctrine, and is, according to Philotheus, very antichristian. In his Epistle to the Hebrews, 10th chap. 9th to 15th verses inclusive, Paul, speaking of Christ, says, "Then said he, Lo, I come, to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which *will we are sanctified*, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, *once for all!* And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But this man, after he had *offered* ONE *sacrifice* for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by ONE *offering* he hath *perfected for ever them* that are *sanctified*. Whereof the Holy Ghost is a witness to us." And in the 18th verse, "Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." We ask Philotheus, if this doctrine is not a little different from his? And does not the words, "*his flesh, of his people*," &c. which is substituted, look like the antichristian doctrine, which undervalues the "blood of the covenant," and makes the personal holiness of the creature an indispensable requisite in salvation, to the exclusion of the meritorious and effectual salvation of Christ? We think it does. And rather than subscribe to a doctrine so derogatory to our Almighty Redeemer and Saviour Jesus Christ, we would submit to receive all the degrading epithets which antichristian zealots can heap upon us. It is our confident hope, that *Philotheus*, will see the inconsistency and impiety of these deductions, which we believe he has unwittingly produced, and embrace the truths of the Gospel of the Saviour, of a once lost, but now redeemed WORLD!

Speaking of Calvinists, our correspondent says, "Calvinists have believed, that by the first great manifestation of God in the flesh of the Virgin Mary, by the suffering, and crucifixion of Jesus, atonement was made to God by the innocent one, who suffered for, and instead of the guilty, a certain elect few, for whom only Christ died. But the Universalists have carried Calvinistic salvation by the outward birth, life, sufferings, and death of Christ, to an universal extent, declaring, that "Jesus Christ tasted death for every man," and atoned on the cross for the sins of all. *For* every man, is not *instead* of every man; if *for* meant instead *of*, no man could ever die; Christ having tasted death instead of all mankind. Deists, note this; you who accuse God of

punishing his innocent Son instead of guilty man. Christ died for man, but not instead of man." We heartily thank Philotheus for this excellent and candid arrangement of the matter; he has marshalled his forces well. But we hope to rout his right wing, take his left prisoners, and with the assistance of our *Captain, Counsellor*, and *Guide*, to clear the field of every *foe!* The Calvinists and Universalists he speaks of, are alike impotent, erroneous, and their doctrines indefensible; but not more so than those who would achieve, by the agency and assistance of the creature, that which they deny to the ability or inclination of the Creator to perform. We will first state what Christ did not die for; *second*, the end for which he died. *First*, Christ did not die to save man from the *death* of the *body;* neither did Christ die to appease the wrath of God, nor to *reconcile* God to *man;* neither did Christ die *instead* of man, the *innocent* instead of the *guilty*. We will now prove what Christ died for; and if the end for which he died shall appear, from the plain tenor of the Scriptures, to be different from the abovementioned ends, they will need no other refutation. The name given to Christ, was declarative of the end of his mission; "Jesus, because he shall save his people from their sins." He therefore died to save his people from, not *in* their sins. We cannot help making a pause.—Is not man inconsistent and unreasonable beyond measure? Is it possible for language to be plainer? for words to be more expressive? for an expression to be more consolatory? Why all this cavilling? From whence these doubts and objections? Is God unworthy of credit? Do you dispute the declaration of the Most High? And you, ye partialists, who "respect the persons of men in judgment;" and actuated by the spirit of the "elder brother," foam with indignation when the *music* of *salvation* salutes your ear;—you, who would rather remain in "the field," than enter your "Father's house," lest you should witness the joys, and divide your inheritance with your brother;—produce the will or testament of the Almighty Father; put your finger on the *codicil* which makes you the *heir*, and *disinherits* one *offspring* of our Almighty Father! "I will give him for a covenant of the people, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth. God is love. I Am God, I change not. God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Much more, then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if when we were *enemies* we were *reconciled to God* by the *death* of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. Be it known unto you, that Christ is the head of every man; we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones; we were crucified with him, buried with him, and have risen with him. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same; that, through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them, who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on *him the nature of angels;* but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. On him was laid the iniquities of us all; and with his stripes we are healed. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. And having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. The last enemy shall be destroyed, death." We have now very important questions to ask. Who was the first enemy? *Ans.* Sin. Can the first enemy exist, after the last is destroyed? Can the cause remain after the effect ceases? or can the effect cease, so long as the cause remains? We answer, NO! Did all men die in Adam? and if so, did not all men, Adam excepted, suffer the consequence of sin, death, without being actual transgressors, by *overt* acts, in their own persons? And did not all men, therefore, suffer, the innocent with the guilty? And as "Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived," did not Adam voluntarily take part of the same forbidden fruit out of love for his wife, and not out of love for the fruit? And did not Christ, the second Adam, take part of the forbidden fruit, when he took our sins, and "bare them in his own body on the tree? And are not all men, or human nature in the aggregate, "bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh;" in the same sense in which Adam considered Eve, to "be bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh?" And did not Christ, the husband of human nature, do this out of love to his wife, when she was dead in trespasses and sin, as Adam did for his wife, when she was dead in trespasses and sin? And was not Christ guilty in the same ratio, that all mankind were guilty of sin in Adam? And did not the apostle allude to this, when he said of Christ, that "he endured the cross; despising the shame," &c? And again, when he says, "The creature was made subject to vanity, *not willingly*, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope?" And as Adam and Christ are placed parallel in the Scriptures, and it is declared, that as by man came death, by man also, Christ, came the resurrection and the life; and death coming by the first Adam on his first appearing, and his first transgression, does not the life come by Christ, the second Adam, on his first appearing, and suffering for the transgression of his members or bride? And if it does not come at his first appearing, is not the offence greater than the gift, instead of the gift being greater than the offence? And as mankind do not suffer in their own persons the conscious death, or wages of sin, until they are actual transgressors, although they died in Adam; so mankind do not enjoy the consciousness of salvation and eternal life in Christ, although they are made alive, and saved in him with an everlasting salvation, until they are actually believers in him and in this salvation, or eternal life, which is in the Son of God, for them, and was as much effected by Christ, at his first appearing, as the sin, or death, was effected by Adam for them at his appearing. And it follows, inevitably, that all mankind will assuredly be made partakers of the life, as that they were made partakers of the death.' "But every man in his own order. Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." The unbeliever in these truths, and all are necessarily unbelievers who do not understand them, will object to this union of Christ and human nature, his church. It will be objected that Christ was without sin. Granted—and human nature was without sin, in the same sense Christ was without sin,—for mankind fell in Adam without transgression in their own individual capacities, and Christ was without sin in his own individual capacity; but by being made partaker of the same flesh and blood of mankind, he was necessarily made partaker of their sins. For their nature being impure by the transgression of the first Adam, and afterwards by their own transgression, Christ, their head, by taking the nature, or flesh of his members, was laden with all their imperfections. If this was not strictly true, it could not be said, "With his stripes we are healed." Neither could it be said, that "he purged our sins, and cleansed us, and purified us, a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle." The prophet declared, "All we like sheep have gone astray; and on him was laid the iniquities of us all." And Christ declared, that he was the "good shepherd, and that he gave his life for the sheep." And to indentify his sheep, declared, "I give my life for the world." And to prove that both Jew and Gentile were included, he speaks of two sheepfolds, but declares, that he must bring them all into himself, the good Shepherd, that there may be one fold and one Shepherd. It may likewise be objected by the unbeliever, that mankind suffer death, without actual transgression in their own persons, and infants may be adduced to prove the fact. We answer—the death of the body, or the putting off the *garment* of *flesh*, or dissolving the tabernacle of clay, is a blessing. The Scriptures are positive in their declaration, that the "*sting of death is sin.*" Therefore, there cannot be the *sting*, without the knowledge of sin; for "by the *law* is the *knowledge* of *sin.*" And the infant is ignorant of the *law*, ignorant of sin, and consequently free from the sting of death. We now ask Philotheus, if he believes that "Christ took part of our flesh and blood, and as it behoved him, in *all things* was made like unto his brethren?" And if this is granted, and we do not see how it can be denied; we ask, is Christ now laden with "the iniquities of us all?" And if this is answered in the *negative*, we ask *Philotheus*, whether SALVATION is by the *first*, or *second* appearing of Christ? And if "Christ shall appear the *second* time, WITHOUT SIN UNTO SALVATION, will it not be in the *fulness* of times, which "God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began, and which the Scriptures declare to be the "RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS?" And did not the prophets speak of this, when they testified, that the "*covenant* with death should be *disannulled*, and the agreement with *hell* should *not* stand? That "death should be swallowed up in victory;" and that "sin and transgression should be remembered no more?" And that "All nations whom God had made should come and worship before him, and glorify his name; and all the ends of the world remember and *turn unto God;* and all the *kindreds* of the *nations* should worship before him; for the earth is the Lord's, and he is the governor among the nations?"

Philotheus asks, "If the Calvinists are

wrong for looking to the outward and typical coming of the Messiah for the salvation of an elect *few*,—are not the Universalists in the same kind of error, for expecting the salvation of *all*, through the same outward and typical advent of the Son of God? For it has been shown above, that salvation is not in this outward manner, which was a type; but in an inward power by the Antitype, and only Saviour, God." We ask Philotheus, by whom was the "outward manner or type?" Was it by *God*, or *man?* Was it by a *Saviour*, or by a *destroyer?* Suppose you were to give a pauper ten thousand dollars, and the pauper was to tell you, this *money* is only a *type*, it is merely *outward* in the *manner* of it; *but* the *value* of *it* is in *my* receiving *it;* your *giving* the *money* is but a *trifle;* it is *my receiving* it, that makes *me rich?* It is our opinion, that your admiration of the man's sagacity would be more than counterbalanced by your disgust at his ingratitude. Your classification of Calvinists and Universalists is not objectionable. There never was a Calvinist yet who could support his hypothesis any other way than shutting his Bible, divesting himself of reason, libelling nature, and outraging common sense. And Universalists, who would save all men, by proving that there is no devil to destroy them; or if they fear the devil, destroy the Son of God, to save themselves, are as correct as the Calvinists; and between them both, would destroy every thing in the universe, without sparing even the Creator himself! We believe God, who has declared, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thy help." We believe God is not a *destroyer*, but a *Saviour*. It is immaterial to us how many hells, or devils, or deaths there are. But it is of the utmost consequence to us, that we should be the redeemed of the Lord, and have eternal life *in* Christ, and be *in him* reconciled to God; and through and by him have the victory over all things, that can "hurt or destroy." We consider the appellation, *Universalist*, to be very vague and indefinite. The *Stoic*, who would destroy evil and pain, by being insensible to their effe ts;—the *Skeptic*, whose doubts would annihilate even his own unbelief;—the *Atheist*, who denies the existence or indentity of any heaven or hell;—the *Deist*, who denies the existence of the soul after death;—and the *Theist*, who considers the Creator of all worlds as the origin, source, centre, and end of all things, are, by fair inference, according to the common acceptation of the term, Universalists, because they deny the endless misery of any creature. The worshippers of Jugernaut, of Fo, of the Sun, and indeed all Idolaters of any description, are, by fair inference, *Orthodox*, because they believe in the misery of all those who do not belong to their faith, and bend the knee to their image. But to us there is but "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who *is* above all, and through all, and in you all." The religion of Jesus is the religion of nature; and the religion of nature is the religion of God. The *learned nonsense* which has been *poured* upon the world by *polemic divines*, and which has produced a confusion of religious sentiment and doctrine, equal to the confusion of languages at Babel, has lost much of its gloss, and is fast verging to merited and irretrievable disgrace and oblivion. A new *era* is dawning upon the world of mankind. The iron visage of superstition is at length seen through the covering, which her deluded votaries had veiled her with. The light of eternal truth has pierced the clouds, which for centuries has enveloped the world in darkness; and the rays of the Sun of Righteousness penetrated the caverns of the inquisition, destroyed the engines of torture, proclaimed good-will to man, and the standard of *peace* is raised on the ruins of monkish superstition and ecclesiastical tyranny and oppression. "This is the Lord's doings; it is wonderful in our eyes. O Lord God of Hosts, who *is* a strong Lord like unto thee? or to thy faithfulness round about thee? The heavens *are* thine; the earth is thine; the world and the fulness thereof, thou hast founded them. Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne; mercy and truth shall go before thy face. Blessed *is* the people that know the joyful sound; they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy countenance. In *thy name* shall they rejoice all the day; and *in thy righteousness* shall they be exalted. For the Lord is our defence; and the Holy One of Israel is our King."

(To be concluded next week)

Note. The duty we owe our correspondents, obliges us to continue our remarks on Philotheus, *to the next Number.*

COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

DEAR SIR,

By giving the following extract, taken from one of our daily papers published in this city, and the observations made on the same, a place in your useful paper, you will confer a favour on a subscriber.

"*Horrid Transaction.*—The Western Reserve Chronicle, printed at Warren, Trumbell County, Ohio, of the first instant, gives a distressing account of the death of Philemon, William, and Cyrus, three only children of Mr. Zaphna and Lois Stone, of Kinsman, in that county, who were drowned by the hand of their mother. The circumstances are peculiar, and were communicated for publication by a clergyman. Mr. and Mrs. Stone *possessed amiable dispositions; sustained unblemished characters; and had lived together in the utmost harmony.* During a late revival of religion, Mrs. Stone was awakened, and supposed she had experienced a change of heart. Soon after, however, she settled down in a state of gloom and melancholy, and declared she had committed the unpardonable sin. Under this impression, and believing that if taken off at their present tender age, the children would be happy, and believing also, that having committed the unpardonable sin, no injury would follow to herself—while her husband was gone to meeting on Sunday, the 14th May, she drowned the little innocents in a spring about three feet deep. Verdict of the coroner's inquest, Drowned by the mother in a fit of insanity."

After perusing the above extract, the following thoughts presented themselves to my mind. This Mrs. S., according to the orthodoxy of the age, was without hope and without God in the world; for, says the clergyman, "Mrs. S. was awakened, and supposed she had experienced a change of heart;" and yet this Mrs. S. "possessed an amiable disposition, sustained an unblemished character, and had lived with her husband in the utmost harmony." A change of heart was necessary, and why? Probably she had not yet believed in the *doctrine of an unmerciful punishment.* She had not yet given her attention to the contemplation of the *heart-withering doctrine of endless torment*; but during the revival of religion her attention was arrested, and she converted to the religion of the day, to the orthodox doctrine of an implacable, vindictive, and enraged Deity, and unutterable, never-ending torment and despair. Her *sincerity* was her *destruction*,—she *believed* what her teachers *pretended*,—there was but one alternative,—she saw herself a sinner, Omnipotence incensed,—justice without mercy demanded the sacrifice, and her *fears* pointed to her as the victim,—there remained one ligature which despair had not severed,—it was the last point in creation which hope could dwell on,—it was death!—a mother's love prompted,—HELL executed,—and destruction saved the souls of her children. Let these spiritual incendiaries behold the frenzied mother, and horror-struck father, standing aghast and speechless over the victims of their cruelty, sacrificed on the altar of modern orthodoxy. The last struggle of the burning infant, kindled in Moloch's gloomy worshipper a dawn of hope, for Moloch could be appeased; but the demon whom your traditions conjured up in the terrified imagination of your proselyte, rioted in misery, despised mercy, and revelled in destruction. Let the teachers of these abominable doctrines add these three to the already swelled catalogue of their victims, and settle the account with their consciences. This is called a "horrid transaction." No doubt all will agree to that; but what led her to commit this horrid deed? She was taught that there is a sin unpardonable in its own nature; that a person may commit that sin, and yet not be fully sensible of it, on account of the *mysteries in religion;* and that this sin admits of no repentance here, nor hereafter; and if it even could be repented of, no forgiveness could be expected? Is not her insanity, so called, easily accounted for? She unfortunately believed her teachers; but why did she take away the lives of her children? Let the insane woman answer for herself. "*If they are taken off at their present tender age, they will be happy.*" She must have been under the full belief of the common doctrine of the day, that if they had lived to the age of accountability, they would more than probably be lost. I will only put these questions to the teachers of the above sentiments, and close the subject. If these doctrines are true, did the woman act insane? If she was insane, did not faith in your doctrines (I call them *yours*, because they are not found in the testimony of God) make her so? And is not the belief of your sentiments the strongest proof we have that she was insane? Is it not an inevitable consequence, that the misery of those who profess this faith, will increase in proportion to their faith; and that their salvation proceeds from their doubts, and their damnation from their sincerity, and the greater their sincerity, the more intolerable their suffering?

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

It may seem strange at first view, that there should be so great difference *in*, and so many kinds of *faith*, as there is at the present day

among those who profess to believe in the same God. If the same God was the object of the saints faith formerly, that we pretend so variously to believe in, and were we governed by the same principles they were, we should not differ as to our faith in Christ from them. Why was there not such a striking difference in the days of the apostles, relative to the religion of Jesus, as exists at the present day? Is it not because God was the real, and not, as at this day, the pretended object of faith? There is a vast difference between the *real* and the *ideal* existence of a thing. If our faith is predicated upon our own conceptions of Deity, aside from the Scriptures, is it marvellous that we should differ as variously as we have been taught to conceive the thing different? No! If our faith proceeds from real knowledge of God, conveyed to us through the medium of his Spirit, where is the cause of difference? Should we not all agree that Jesus is Lord by the Holy Ghost, as universally, as we agree that *sugar* is *sweet*, and *vinegar sour* by the *taste?* But if we speculate about Deity, and have no other knowledge of him, than that which is merely prescriptive, figurative, and allegorical, what can we know of him with certainty? Will prescriptions, figures and allegories, give any man the essential knowledge of simple comprehensible things? Certainly not. How then is it possible to know any thing certainly of God, who is infinite and incomprehensible, by the same means? And are not these the means, and I was going to say the only means, used to know God, and at the same time rejected as insufficient to convey any adequate idea of simple things? How degrading and unworthy of the knowledge of Deity do we render ourselves, by taking this ground to know him? Hence, is not the great *variety*, or rather, the *want* of true faith, plainly accounted for? If I am not mistaken in this, the next thing to be inquired, is what will cause unity of faith, in the bonds of unspeakable peace?

AN IMPARTIALIST.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

In the professing religious world, we hear much of vital religion, experimental religion, and religious experience, while believers in a finished salvation, for *all* mankind, are generally supposed to be destitute of such feelings; supposed to be merely cold calculators, having but little warmth of feeling, and denying the work of the Spirit upon the heart. Such, however, is not the case. They do not, it is true, attach the same meaning to the above-named phrases, neither are they found so often with them on their lips; they place no dependence upon their religious frames, as being in any degree the procuring cause of their acceptance with God. They have the full assurance, that they are the children of God, and the ground of it is, "that God is the Father of the spirits of all flesh;" they, therefore, have no doubts, and they do most cheerfully acknowledge the work of the Spirit upon the heart, and that its influences are great. James, in his general Epistle, 1st chap. 27th verse, informs us, that "*pure* and *undefiled* religion," consists in "visiting the fatherless and widows in their afflictions;" and this, methinks, is far preferable to what professors of the present day appear to consider as *pure religion* and undefiled. The apostles did not speak of doubting, as respected their final salvation, and of the consequent fearings, sorrowings and despondencies, which are the concomitants of such a state. They were, it is true, often depressed under the consciousness of the depravity of human nature, of their being such unprofitable servants, after having received so much from the hands of a gracious Master. It was under the influence of such feelings, that Paul exclaimed, "Miserable man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death." But looking forward to the cheering prospect which opened to his view beyond the bounds of time, he could in faith triumphantly exclaim, "Thanks be to God who hath given us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord." Never for one moment did he doubt of "his acceptance in the Beloved." Was it not vital religion which led him to exclaim, "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out; for who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? or who hath first given him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things, to whom be glory for ever, Amen." The strong conviction, that when the fulness of the Gentiles was come in, all Israel should be saved, rested with such an indelible impression upon his mind, that out of the fulness of a heart overflowing with gratitude to his Father God, he was constrained to give it vent in this rapturous exclamation. In all this there was nothing like melancholy, but rather an ecstasy of feeling, which seemed to lift the soul far above all terrestrial bondage, and to give it more than a prelibation of the joys of heaven. Indeed, no language is glowing enough, to describe the gratitude that swells in the believer's bosom, when, with the clear eye of faith, he perceives what God has done for his soul. And how is it heightened, when he is enabled to look upon every son and daughter of Adam as blessed of the common Father, whose will it is, that they shall "inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world?" What though he sees "the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain?" yet he knows that Deity, "from seeming evil still educes good." He knows that "the storms of wintry time will quickly pass;" and when *all* shall know God as their kind indulgent Father, and Jesus Christ their Saviour, then shall an "unbounded spring of heavenly joys encircle all." Such, Mr. Editor, are my views of the religion of the heart; such its cheering influence. Receiving all mankind as equally loved of the Father, it operates as a stimulous to every good and virtuous deed. And such methinks will be the feelings of those, whom John, in prophetic vision, "heard, saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him who sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever."

If you think these remarks will be of any service to your readers, you are at liberty to publish them in your paper; and the writer would be gratified to see further remarks from you, or any one who might think the subject worthy of comment.

Pull the beam out of thine own eye.

It is understood we have been accused of *perverting* the Scriptures, by limiting the word *everlasting*. This word is connected with the punishment of the wicked, but *six* times in the New Testament. The original word is αιων.* Now this word is used *seventy* times in the Scriptures, and in a *limited* sense; consequently, those who give it an *unlimited* sense, pervert it *seventy times*, while we pervert it only *six* times! Our *accusers*, therefore, are *guilty* in the ratio of *seventy* degrees, and we *six* degrees. This is really a mote, compared with their BEAM!

* *Note.* This word in the *singular*, is *age*; in the plural, *ages*. This same word is translated *ages,—world; for ever,—everlasting,—eternal,*—and once, "*of old*"!!!

"*If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.*"

This declaration was made by John, the apostle and servant of Christ. John does not say, that he has a hope if the elect, or the *good, regenerate, pious* people, if they should sin, will have an advocate; but "if *any man* sin, we have an advocate with the Father." What is the duty of an advocate? Is it not to do all in his power to benefit the cause of his client? Is it not to prove his client innocent of the crimes alleged against him, and to procure a verdict in his favour? We believe it is. And, further, we believe an advocate would be far from doing his duty, who should neglect to clear his client from even the imputation of blame, were it in his power so to do.

On the authority of John, the inspired apostle of Christ, we declare, that Jesus Christ is the advocate for sinners, without the exception of ONE. And we ask, will Jesus Christ, whom the Scriptures declare to be the Saviour, and to be One who is *Mighty to save*, will he leave his client to be a prey to his enemy? No! His "blood cleanseth from all sin; he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world." He, the Almighty Advocate, himself bore the sins of his clients, and with them endured the cross, and despising the shame, has purged them from all sin, and has declared, that the verdict to be pronounced, "is life everlasting." "I came not to *judge* the world, but to *save* the world. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And *I know* that his commandment is life everlasting." John, 12th Chap.

An Important Question.

How can "*Christ* be the *Saviour* of *all* men," without *all* men are *saved* by *him?*

To Correspondents.

A number of communications are unavoidably postponed, &c. Theodore shall be seasonably noticed.

Correspondents are requested to *put a signature* to their communications; a single letter of the alphabet is sufficient.

All Communications forwarded to the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter-box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD-STREET.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1820. NO. 11.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Remarks on Philotheus.
(Concluded.)

The last paragraph in the communication of Philotheus, is, in our opinion, "death in the pot." It is, strictly speaking, analogical reasoning, and we think contains an unanswerable argument against his hypothesis. Speaking of the Jews, he says, "They, expecting an *external* Messiah, were cut off. And they, who are depending on an outward, or *external* sacrifice and atonement for sin, are, as I believe, in the same *outward* error of the Jews, and liable to condemnation with them. Let this, therefore, be a warning to Calvinists, Universalians, and all others who see the truth of it." We say, *Amen* to every word of this. But who are they who are *depending* on an outward *sacrifice* and *atonement* for sin? Let us pursue the analogy introduced by Philotheus, and examine the error of the Jews, and see, who in our days are cherishing the same error, and beguiled by the same delusion. What was the *error* of the Jews? Answer, they thought Christ was come to "restore the kingdom to Israel, and free them from the Roman power. And Paul, speaking of the Jews, said, "I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ *is* the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth." We now ask, what is the *righteousness* of God which Paul refers to? We answer, in the words of Paul, "The righteousness of God, by faith *of*," not *in*, "Jesus Christ unto ALL, and upon ALL them that believe; *for there is no difference;*" why? "For ALL have sinned and come short of the glory of God." And the same apostle told the Galatians, they were justified *by* the FAITH OF CHRIST; not *their* faith *in* Christ. And to the Romans he says, of Christ, "Who was delivered *for* our offences, and was raised again *for* our justification; therefore," wherefore? *Ans.* "being justified, by faith," or belief of this truth, "we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

When were we justified? *Ans.* When Christ rose from the dead! How were we justified? *Ans.* Christ manifested his faith, when he said, Destroy this temple, or this body, and in three days I will raise it again. What constituted the temple or body of which Christ spake? *Ans.* The whole family of Adam, all men. *Proof.* "Christ is the head of every man; we are the members of his *body*, of his *flesh*, and of his bones." Were all the members united to the Head, when the Head, Christ, was crucified and rose from the dead? *Ans.* Yes. *Proof.* "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will *draw all men* unto *me*. If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; and if one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it. If one died for all, then were all dead, or all died. We *were crucified* with him, *buried* with him, and have *risen* with him." What is the meaning of the word justified?* *Ans.* It is to be pronounced innocent, and free from guilt. Did Christ make man innocent, and free him from guilt? *Ans.* Yes. *Proof.* "The blood of Christ cleanseth from *all sin*. He bare our sins in his own body on the tree; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man. He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. And having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether *they be* things in earth or things in heaven." Therefore, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. AND YE ARE COMPLETE IN HIM; which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also you are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye have risen with *him*, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having *forgiven you all trespasses;* blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; *and* having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-*days;* which are a shadow of things to come; but the body *is* of Christ." We now ask Philotheus, Are those, who depend on this *sacrifice* and *atonement* for sin, in the same *outward* error of the Jews, and liable to condemnation with them? Christ says, "My kingdom is not of this world." Is the *atonement* and *sacrifice* we trust in, of this world? Christ speaking of his flesh and blood given for the *life* of the world, declares, "The words that I speak, they are *Spirit*, and they are *life*." Is not the *atonement* and *sacrifice* above-mentioned, *Spirit* and *life?* And is not the *atonement* which Philotheus speaks of, and every other *atonement*, but the *atonement* above-mentioned, different from the *atonement* of Christ, and consequently not *spirit*, nor *life;* but an *outward* atonement, and liable to condemn all who believe and trust in it? On the authority of Christ and his apostles, we say, YES!

The *note*, annexed to Philotheus' communication, and which is added as an exposition of the word *Gospel*, we think liable to serious objections. We ask Philotheus, whether the word in the Greek language, which Paul put for *gospel*, was derived from the Saxon? If it was, Philotheus' exposition is correct; and if the Saxon *word*, which the English word gospel is *derived* from, has the same meaning with the Greek *word*, we have no objection to his exposition; but, unfortunately for Philotheus' hypothesis, this is not the case. Christ told his disciples to "go and *preach* the *gospel* to every creature." The original word, which is translated *preach*, is synonymous with *proclaim*, *teach*, *make known*, *tell*, &c.; and the *gospel* is the *thing*, or *fact*, or *news*, which is to be made known. Now, according to Philotheus' exposition, this gospel, or news, is "not *to* them," or *for them* who do not believe it; but *for* those who believe it, and consequently know it already. The gospel cannot be said, with any *propriety*, or *truth*, to be *news* to *those* who *know* it; and as it is "*not to them*" who do not *know it*, it cannot be *news* to any person whatever! Paul, speaking of Christ, says, "Who was raised according to my gospel." And again, "I have fully preached the gospel of Christ." Now, if the word gospel is synonymous with Christ, we might read, "I have fully preached the *Christ* of *Christ*." Again, "Christ was raised, according to my Christ." The original word is Ευαγγελιον, and signifies *good news*, or *glad tidings*. Surely the news of a thing cannot be *the* thing itself. When the power of God accompanies the good news, or tidings, men believe the news, or tidings, or gospel; and not till then. And the *news* is, that "the whole world, all men, every man, *are* created anew in Christ, and are saved with an everlasting salvation." And if this *news*, or gospel, was not true before they were called upon to believe it, they were called upon to believe a lie, and they make that true, by believing which was not true before! "Therefore, we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God; who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe." And we are determined "these things to command and teach." That God will, in "*due* time," accompany, by his power, the *good news* to Philotheus, and make him "wise unto salvation," is the confident hope of the Editor, who subscribes himself with respect and esteem to Philotheus.

*Quere. Are not the words *atonement*, *reconciliation*, *justification*, *intercession*, and *salvation*, synonymous terms in the Scriptures?

COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

In your remarks on my subject in Number 7. I presume you cannot agree with me respecting the Cherubims. There are not any

laws of permission oy themselves, or separate from the laws of Divine Providence, and according to order. Your superficial view of this order cannot change the Divine power, nor if rightly considered, will ever expose its inconsistency. It is true, to the natural-minded man it is a mystery above his comprehension; but to the spiritual-minded man it is as clear as the sun at noonday. The visions, and various representations seen in those visions, by the spiritual eyes being opened, were representative of the various states of the church among the Jews; and if you will strictly examine that prophet's visions, consider the causes, and read his explanations with an enlightened understanding, you may perceive, and see the truths therein explained; for the prophet himself shows the cause why such visions and orders were given to him, in order that he might expose the abuse of the Lord's permissive and Divine Providence at that time. Fallacious reasoning from the natural man will deny these facts; but with the spiritual-minded man they are rightly understood, and considered according to their order and permission from the Lord.

Beasts have respect to the affections in man according to their quality; the good, according to good affections, and the evil, according to evil affection. Oxen and calves were both of them significative of innocence or good affections, and the sacrifices offered of these beasts, were representative of that state of mind in which the affections were when the offerings were made to the Lord, and of course were representative of a state of purification, when appointed to support the brazen sea. Now, the brazen sea was appointed for washing. Washing represented a state of purification. I mean, the washing of the external body, from filth and uncleanness, represented the washing of the soul or internal body, from all evil, unclean, and filthy, or sinful desires. The Providence of God is here represented by the Cherubims, as mentioned in the 7th chap. 1st book Kings, 29th verse, and which ought to be well considered by all ministers of the Lord's most holy word at this day, as well as in the days of Solomon.

The priests were forbidden to enter the Holy of Holies, without washing in the brazen sea. The figures of these animals had no life, but were representative of a holy, pure, and innocent life. But it was never designed by the Lord, that the Israelites should worship the golden calf, 32d Exodus; this signified carnal pleasure. The he-goat corresponded to the natural man; and the he and the she-goat signified natural truths, from which the delights of such men were derived. All birds or animals that are named in the word, correspond to, or represent the various states of man. The Egyptians worshipped a calf, from whence the Israelates became idolaters. They were versed in these sciences, which represented their infernal loves, and those pleasures were to them most delightful. There is not an expression in the 7th chap. 1st book Kings, to prove that Cherubims are living creatures. I do not write from supposition, but from plain simple facts, as related in the unerring word of God. If the Cherubims are living creatures, the lyons and oxen must likewise be living creatures. It is true there were wheels to move the moulten sea from one place to another; but these did not give life to the animals, but were representatives. The Lord spoke with Moses, 25th Exod. 20th verse, from between the Cherubims in the ark, in which was contained the word given by the Lord to Moses, for a preservation of what was holy from profanation. The word being deposited in the Holy of Holies, signified the Lord's providential care of those mysteries of faith therein contained, from being abused by the Jews, and causing their eternal ruin.

The cherub Ezekiel saw, 9th chap. from 3d to 6th verse, where the glory of the God of Israel was shown to him, and commands given to the man clothed in white linen, was of and from the Lord's divine providence, to preserve his church upon earth, and to prevent those mysteries of heavenly Divine truth, represented by Cherubims, from being misused, and causing the destruction of the immortal part of man. Is it not the case at this day, that faith alone, separate from, or disunited with charity, is a doctrine much propagated and believed? This error is of great consequence, and separates St. Paul's assertions in the 13th chap. 1st Corinthians, wherein he unites them as essential to salvation. Your questions are some of them already answered, in your publication, Number 7. But you seem inclined to draw forth those internal truths I might produce, on purpose to ridicule and oppose them. For this reason I shall decline answering your question, "From whence did Adam's daughters get their husbands?" This could easily be answered, according to the internal or spiritual sense of the word. We do not read that marriages, or a conjugal union, did not take place with Cain and others, at that period of time when they were united together. My idea is, that the Lord s declaration in the 2d Genesis, 24th verse, constitutes what I call a union, or heavenly marriage, and presume such was Cain's.

I consider Adam as the first man who sinned, and as a representative of the first church. On this subject much might be added; but perhaps not believed by some. I never read of angels having four faces, &c., but ask you the question. We may call internal, wicked, and evil dispositions, devils in a human form, and compare weeds to the internal state of man, (which I have already explained,) and are cultivated in man's life, while he is spared in this world. The good and faithful man casts them out; for where the good of life prevails, no infernal weeds can grow. I do not understand what you mean by the race of Adam: Explain yourself more fully.

REMARKS.

Our correspondent says, "Your *superficial* view of this order, cannot change the Divine power, nor if rightly considered, will ever *expose* its *inconsistency*." Here is a *tacit* acknowledgment that it is *inconsistent*, and we think we have *exposed* it. We are, however, "*naturally-minded*," and our correspondent's *views* are "*above our comprehension*." This we agree to; and we have our fears that a *large* majority of our readers will be found to be likewise unfortunate, and find it *above theirs*. The charge of *ridiculing* brought by our correspondent, we think is a *little* severe. We intended it for argument; but it being *naturally-minded*, we suppose our *spiritual friend* did not understand it. In fine, we have a very *natural* propensity to believe the prophet Ezekiel's testimony, relative to the *cherubims being living creatures;* and we prefer it, on the whole, to the *spiritual mind* which denies the fact. Relative to the question respecting angels with *four* faces, we observe, that angels are ministers, or messengers of God, and are living creatures; so are the *cherubims*: See Ezekiel, 1st and 10th chapters. To conclude—if our correspondent was to use one half of the exertion to make his doctrine agree with the Scriptures, that he does to twist the Scriptures, to force them to conform to his doctrine or hypothesis, he would evince a more *true spiritual mind*, and be much more intelligible to his readers.

Note By the *race* of *Adam*, we mean the *family*, *generation*, and *breed* of Adam. *All men* universally; whether *naturally* minded, or *spiritually*-minded, or if they have *no minds* at all!

On the Testimony of Prophecy, in regard to the Divine Person and Character of Jesus Christ.

(*Concluded from page* 32.)

But what shall we say is implied in the terms resurrection and life? What can be implied, but the power of raising man from the dead, and thus gifting him with eternal life? But since none can be gifted with eternal life, except such as are regenerate, or born anew, therefore the power of regenerating man, or of creating him anew, is also involved in the terms, the resurrection and the life. But who can regenerate man, or thus communicate spiritual and internal life, except the great Father of being, whom we call God? Jesus Christ, then, in calling himself the resurrection and the life, positively declares himself to be that great Father of being, and none else.

You may, perhaps, think it some drawback on the above testimony, that when the mother of Zebedee's children requested of Jesus, that "her sons might sit, one on his right hand, and the other on his left, in his kingdom," Matt. xx. 21. Jesus replied, "To sit on my right hand and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father;" verse 23. No such words, however, are to be found in the original language; for if you consult your Greek Testament, you will perceive, that the words in our English translation, "it shall be given," are an interpolation, and that the passage, therefore, ought to be thus rendered, "To sit on my right hand and on my left, is not mine to give, but (or except) to those for whom it is prepared of the Father." Thus Jesus does not say that it was not his to give, but that he could only give it to those who were in a state of preparation to receive it.

But I should exhaust all your patience, was I to comment at large upon all those passages in the New Testament, which prove that the whole of the Godhead was thus transferred to, and united with, Jesus Christ in his divine humanity, and that, consequently, Jesus Christ did not speak, or act, at any time from a deputed power, but from the Eternal Father himself, dwelling in, and incorporated with him. He accordingly bears this testimony concerning himself, "If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also, and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. Philip saith unto him, Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father? Believest thou not

that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" John xiv. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. And again, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life." John x. 27, 28. And again, "Behold, I give unto you the power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy." Luke x. 19. And again, "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me, and he that seeth me, seeth him that sent me." John xii. 44, 45. And again, "Father, all mine are thine, and thine are mine." John xvii. 10. You see, therefore, plainly, how Jesus and the Father were one, Jesus being the Father made known and visible, and thus an object of human faith and apprehension, differing in no respect from the Eternal Father, except in regard to the assumed humanity, by which the invisible and unknown Father was rendered both visible, known, and approachable also, to his otherwise lost creatures.

Did this point want any further confirmation, I might proceed to lay before you the testimony of the Apostolic writers on the important subject, who are unanimous in exalting Jesus Christ to divine honour and glory in his eternal union with the Father. Thus the Apostle Paul testifies, "Christ is over all, God blessed for ever." Romans ix. 5. In like manner the Apostle John, "We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." 1 John, v. 20. And also Jude, "To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever." Verse 25. But not in no part of the Sacred Oracles is this point more fully insisted on, or more decidedly confirmed, than in the Apocalyptic pages; for we there read, how the beloved Apostle John was gifted with a sight of Jesus Christ in his Divine humanity, which he describes in the most sublime and affecting language. Revelations ii. 12 to 29. But what is the testimony which this great Saviour gives of himself on this magnificent occasion? Let us hear it from his own mouth. "I AM THE FIRST AND THE LAST. I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and of death." Verses 17, 18. But who can be called the first, but the Supreme God? Who, also, but the Supreme God can have *the keys of hell and death?* When Jesus Christ then calleth himself the first, and declares that he hath *the keys of hell and death*, he proves to a demonstration, that he is the Supreme and only God, since it is impossible to suppose that there can be *two* firsts, or *two* keepers *of the keys of hell and death.* Again, as we proceed in this inspired book, we find the Lamb, by which is meant, the Divine humanity of Jesus Christ, (see John i. 29, 36.) perpetually identified with the Eternal Father, Rev. v. 6, 8, 12, 13.,* and afterwards an account is given of the *marriage* of the Lamb. Rev. xix. 7, 8, 9. chap. xxi. 9. But what can this *marriage of the* Lamb mean, except his sacred conjunction with his church or people, by virtue of that faith and love which they derive from him? Jesus Christ, then, in his Divine humanity, is here evidently proved to be the Divine Bridegroom and Husband of his Bride and Wife, the church, which is a proof as evident, that he is no other than the Eternal Jehovah, who, in the Old Testament, is so frequently called both the Bridegroom and Husband of his people. Isaiah lxii. 5. chap. liv. 5. Jer. xxi. 32 Hos. ii. 16. For how can the church have more than one Bridegroom and one Husband?

In vain do the Unitarians object, on this occasion, by telling us that Jesus Christ was a *man*, and subject to all the *infirmities* of a *man;* that he *hungered* and *thirsted*, and *endured fatigue*, and was frequently a prey to grief and sorrow; that he suffered, died, and was buried; that he also prayed to his Father; confessed that he came to do the will of his Father; and, in one instance, acknowledged his Father to be greater than himself;—in vain, I say, do they endeavour thus to cast a veil over the Saviour's Divinity, by presenting to our view only the dark shades of his humanity; for it is granted, that Jesus Christ was a man, and such a man too as the Unitarians describe, in regard to weakness, suffering, and dependence on Divine aid. But then it is to be recollected, that he was such a man only in respect to that infirm humanity, which, as was hinted at above, he derived from the mother, and which he successively put off, until he was no longer her son, and no longer called her his mother. See John ii. 4. chap. xix. 26. But he was not such a man, in respect to that glorified or Divine humanity which he successively put on from the Father, and in which he finally ascended into heaven, to reign there in eternal dominion, as God Omnipotent over all things and creatures in heaven and earth. Keep your eyes steadily fixed then on this *twofold* humanity of Jesus Christ, and you will then be enabled to discover the truth. The first, or infirm humanity from the mother, when it had performed its office by manifesting the Eternal Word in the flesh, was by degrees put off, in like manner as every individual man by degrees puts off the corporeal part which he derived from his mother. But the second, or glorified humanity, which was put on from the Father, was, both in origin and quality, altogether distinct from the former, and, consequently, was not subject to infirmity or dissolution. Accordingly we find that this humanity was raised from the tomb by its own Divine power, see John x. 18. even as to its lowest corporeal part, or its flesh and bones, as Jesus Christ himself declared after his resurrection, when he said to his wondering disciples, "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Luke xxiv. 39. It is further to be observed, that this glorified humanity was made visible to the apostles Peter, James, and John at the transfiguration, when "his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." Matt. xvii. 2. And also afterwards in heaven, to the apostle John, *in the midst of seven golden candlesticks*, when it is written, "His countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength." Rev. i. 13 to 19. You are therefore to conclude, with the apostle Paul, that in this second or glorified and Divine humanity, "all the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily," Col. ii. 9., and, consequently, that Jesus Christ, in that humanity, is the great and only God of heaven and earth, the one and only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, to whom is to be ascribed *all glory and dominion for ever and ever.* Amen. Rev. i. 6.

* It is said, at verse 13 of this chapter in the Revelations, "Blessing and honour, and glory and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." But that by him that sitteth on the throne, and the Lamb, are not meant two distinct and separate beings, but only one and the same being, under a twofold character or aspect, viz. as the essential Divinity and Divine humanity, united and made one, is plain, from the mode of expression usually adopted by the apostolic writers, who frequently distinguish one and the same being by a variety of names, as where it is so often written, "Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ;" in all which passages, that God the Father and Jesus Christ mean one and the same being, has been most satisfactorily proved by Mr. Granville Sharpe and Dr. Middleton, in their excellent treatises on the Greek definitive article, to which the reader is referred.

For the Gospel Herald.

MORALITY.

It has become common to a proverb with the enemies and opposers of the doctrine of Universal salvation, to bring as an objection against this God-honouring and man-restoring system, the evil consequences which they conceive naturally result from it. They say, it is productive of licentiousness, and opens a floodgate for all kinds of debauchery and wickedness to rush upon the world, and deluge it with moral corruption. But the "Author and finisher of our faith" be praised, that this objection is unfounded in reason; neither can any such inference be brought from the book of nature, and it is clearly disproved in the revealed word of God. Is it not natural and reasonable for us to love, respect, and listen to the advice and instruction of those whom we have the strongest evidence to believe are our sincere friends? Has not the Almighty Father, the great Architect of the universe, written in indelible characters in the book of nature the principle, that like begets its like? And has not an inspired apostle to the Gentiles, expressly declared in the holy Scriptures, that "we love God because he first loved us?" Hence the morality which is the consequence of the doctrine of Universal salvation, and which is produced by the unlimited and impartial goodness of God,—the morality which is generated and cherished by the knowledge and belief of the truth, that "God is the Saviour of all men, teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly and righteously in this present world." It teaches us to love our enemies, and do good to them that hate us. The Universal salvation of God our Saviour, not only teaches us the purest principles of morality, but also instructs us, that it is our duty and our happiness to practise the Divine commands. It is our joy and delight, our happiness to endeavour to live, as far as in us lies, agreeable to the moral purity of the law of God. Yet we must acknowledge with the inspired penman, that we "find another law in our members, warring against the law of our minds, and bringing us into captivity to the law of sin, which is in our members, so that when we would do good, evil is present with us." We do not contend that we have, or that we can attain to the perfection of moral purity while in the flesh; but we do contend that the doctrine of Universal salvation, when believed in, and understood, will have an inexpressibly greater tendency to reform and moralize its proselytes, than the belief in any other religious doctrine that ever has or will be taught. Our opposers have frequently declared, that if they believed as we do, they would loose the reins of their passions, and riot in sin; and to justify their language, they say, it will make no difference; we may live as we please, for we are sure of being saved at last. I pity them, for

they know not what they say. It is those who are ignorant of the will of God concerning the family of man; those who are strangers to the Saviour and his righteousness; those who have not received, or have not been born in their understanding to the knowledge of the truth; those, and those only, stamp the Gospel of God with this unholy stigma, by saying, "that it produces licentiousness. If all beyond the grave were one vast void of non-existence; if the gloomy doctrine of annihilation were true, and man should be as though he had never been,—still the path of virtue is far preferable to the deceitful maze of sinful mirth. It has been well said, *that virtue is its own reward;* it gives pleasure, peace, and happiness to those who pursue it; but sin soon stingeth its pursuers with the keenest pain. They, therefore, who look for pleasure and happiness, in sinful scenes of revelry, will ultimately find that they have deceived themselves, *and that the way of transgressors is hard.* But to illustrate the moral tendency of the doctrine of Universal salvation, permit me to ask, what would be the feelings of any man, who by misfortune should become a slave in a foreign land, fettered with chains and subjected to the goading stings of the lash of a cruel task-master, and his lodging, a dark, gloomy, and loathsome prison? I ask, what would be the feelings of a man in this situation, with scarcely a hope that he, by his own exertions, would ever be able to regain his liberty, when at the moment he was brooding over his misery, he should hear the massy door of his dungeon grate upon its hinges, and behold a form and countenance approaching him, beaming with humanity,—and was to hear him say, with angelic voice, I have redeemed you, and paid the price of your ransom,—I have come to loose your fetters and restore you to liberty. He frees him from his chains, raises him from his cold and sickly bed; bears him from this miserable scene of wretchedness, to the land of his nativity, and restores him to the enjoyment of his kindred and friends. This being done, I ask, would not the big tear of love and affection fall from his watery eye, and he be ready to clasp in his arms, in speechless gratitude, him who had thus redeemed him? Would not his heart palpitate with the kindest emotions of regard, at the remembrance of his deliverer? I answer, yes,—it is not in man, who is rational, to be ungrateful for such signal deliverance. What is the present situation of the human family? Are they not strangers and foreigners on the earth? Are they not the bond-slaves of sin? and are they not bound by the chains of darkness in the prison of unbelief? And is not heaven and paradise the place of their nativity? I again answer these questions in the affirmative, and in the fulness of my heart, I exclaim, "Hear, O heaven, behold, and be glad, O earth," for Jesus has given himself a ransom for *all*, to be testified in due time. If man is grateful to his temporal benefactor and deliverer, what must be his sensations, when he is brought, by the grace of God, to see that he was bound by the chains of iniquity, in the deep and gloomy cell of ignorance and unbelief, to behold from afar the summit of Calvary, and there witness the price, the ransom that was paid to free all mankind from the bondage of sin and death; to "open the prison doors, to proclaim liberty to the captives, to bind up the broken-hearted, to comfort all that mourn?" Who that thus beholds the Lord of life and glory crucified, and hears him say, even of his murderers, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," and hears him exclaim in his expiring moments, It is finished;—who that views him tasting death for every man, and believes himself the saved of the Lord, without condition or price on his part, will divest himself of gratitude, and "sin, that grace may abound?" If the recollection of a temporal saviour will cause feelings of gratitude to rise within us, how much more will the remembrance of him who saved us with an everlasting salvation, fill our hearts with gratitude, love, and praise to him, who bore the sin of the whole world in his body on the tree. If the knowledge of the true character of God,—the knowledge of his will concerning us,—and the belief that he works all things after the counsel of his own will, tends to produce and cultivate the spirit of love in us, in the same extent, good morals will follow as a natural consequence. And when this benighted world shall behold the Sun of Righteousness arise, with healing in his wings, and see the extent of the salvation of Jesus, we shall then hear the whole family of man exclaim, like the once unbelieving Thomas, "*My Lord and my God.*"

The love of God creates in us
A spirit like his own;
Morality the consequence,
And heaven our final home.

HALCYON.

Calvinistic Baptists and Episcopal Methodists at issue.

The Baptists hold, that once a Christian, always a Christian. The Methodists, that a man may be converted to a true knowledge of God and Christ to-day, and fall away to-morrow, and be endlessly miserable in hell at last. There is one point to which they both tend, as "true as the needle to the pole;" it is the necessity of "*filthy rags,*" without which their garment, or robe of righteousness is incomplete. They both *pretend* to believe, that the *works*, or righteousness of the creature, is at best but "*filthy rags,*" and although *these rags* will not save them, yet, *strange* to tell, they will most assuredly be damned *without them.* How a man can be damned for the want of that, which if he had would be good for nothing; and more, would deserve the appellation of *filthy*, is certainly incomprehensible. We ask the possessors of these *dirty, filthy rags*, whether they expect to carry them to heaven with them? Is it possible for a man to be so *blind*, or *mad*, as to suppose that heaven is a suitable place for *filth?* And is it possible for a man to regard as valuable, in any shape whatever, a *filthy rag?* If not, is it not proof to the point, that those who attach any, the least value to them, believe that they are not *filthy rags*, but a *clean sound garment?* We make this appeal to the reason and the conscience of the reader, and we know that the verdict will be in favour of the truth. We are disposed to take the Scriptures for our guide, and let them decide between the Baptist and Methodist. The Baptist believes that none are *saved* but the *elect*, and that *filthy rags* are an evidence of their *election.* The Methodist denies that *election* is the *cause* of the *salvation* of any man; but contends that "*filthy rags*" are the evidence of, and the *indescribable* non-direct *cause* of the *salvation* of men. The Baptist believes, that a man is not *elected* on account of the *rags*, but the *rags* are, somehow or other, an indispensable ingredient. The Methodist believes, that a man is not *saved* altogether on account of possessing these *rags* of *great* value, but he would not any way do without them. It is however manifest, that what the Methodists mean by *falling away*, is neglecting to increase their stock of *rags;* and that when a man is said to *fall away* from *grace*, he is evidently *implicated* for being deficient in *rags*, and that, in these modern times, *filthy rags* and *grace*, are synonymous terms. The Baptist, when found deficient in *rags*, is considered to be one of the non-elect; and the Methodist, if found deficient in *rags*, his damnation is certain. Reader, if you are disposed to call this ridicule, and to say the matter is treated lightly, open your Bible, and you will find authority to treat this subject in this way, and no other! The *righteousnesses* of the creature are called *filthy rags.* John called the Pharisees, who made great pretensions to *personal holiness*, a "*generation of vipers;*" and Christ called them "*hypocrites, whited sepulchres,* full of *uncleanness.*" We believe the Scriptures; we take their definition to be correct; and we pronounce the creature's righteousness to be *filthy*, and consider *rags* to be the proper name. There is no flattery in the Scriptures, and the reason is obvious,—the Scriptures are truth, and flattery is not truth. The Scriptures declare, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast." It is all of God, free as his sun, which he makes to shine on all, and extensive as his rain, which waters the earth, and blesses all his creatures. And the declaration of Christ, that "It is eternal life to know God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent," proves as strong, as the fiat of Omnipotence can prove, that the Methodist heresy of knowing God one day, and losing that knowledge the next, and being endlessly miserable in consequence of it, is a LIE! For to "know God is life eternal," and none who have eternal life can be miserable without end. See 1st Epistle of John, 5th chap. 9th, 10th and 11th verses. And the Baptist, who declares, that none will ever be saved but those who are elected, and who have *filthy rags* for their credentials, declare a LIE; for "To know God is eternal life, and all shall know him, from the least unto the greatest." In fine, we have the authority of the apostle of Jesus Christ, when we declare, that "He that *believeth not, God hath made him a LIAR*, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son; and this is the record, that WE HAVE ETERNAL LIFE, and that *this life is in his Son.*"

To Correspondents.

A communication in verse, the subject, '*Praise ye the Lord,*' is received. The writer would confer a favour on the Editor, by granting him an interview. A line dropped in the "letter-box," containing the name and number of the residence of the writer, will be attended to.—Timotheus is received. His "contingencies and counterparts" will be attended to.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.
EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.
WILLIAM A. MERCEIN, PRINTER, 93 GOLD-STREET.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 8, 1820. NO. 12.

SERMON, &c.

We republish the following, with a view to eradicate some of the prejudices, and correct some mistakes relative to the opinions and feelings of many persons respecting the doctrine taught, and the principles inculcated, at the church, belonging to "THE SOCIETY OF UNITED CHRISTIAN FRIENDS," *in this City*, of which the *Rev.* EDWARD MITCHELL is *pastor*. This *Sermon* was delivered at his Installation in Boston, 1810; and is a brief view of the leading features of doctrine, and the Scriptures in proof of the same, of those known by the appellation of *Universalists*, in this City.

FIRST TIMOTHY, iv. 9, 10.

This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation. For therefore we both labour, and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe.

That the sayings of God are all faithful, is a position which we presume will not be controverted by any, who call themselves Christians; and yet to this very source, namely, want of confidence in the truth of some of God's sayings, do we trace the almost irreconcilable difference, which separates professing Christians from each other. The sayings of God may all be comprised under what the prophet Isaiah denominates, the Law and the Testimony; *the Law* requires of us love to God and good will to man. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; this is the first commandment; and the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.* God is worthy of the obedience that is here required, and in that obedience man would find a heaven realized on earth; hence God is just, in attaching to the breach of the law, the penalty of death. The soul that sinneth, it shall die;† and cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.‡ But obedience is not the character of man. God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions;"§ the best of them is a briar, the most upright is sharper than a thorn hedge:‖ they are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no not one.** Such is the Law of God, and such the character of man, involving the world in universal guilt and condemnation.

The Testimony of the Creator, respecting our recovery from this dreadful state, was given in Eden, when he declared the promised seed should bruise the serpent's head;†† was repeated to Abram in the promise made, In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed;‡‡ and, because God had made him a father of a multitude of nations, was his name changed to Abraham, signifying father of a great multitude. By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, speaking to Abraham, and the oath concludes with this divine promise, In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.* In conformity with this promise of universal bliss, we find the Psalmist addressing God, and saying, All nations whom thou hast made, shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name;† and the Saviour tells us, they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.‡ Surely this imports an enlightened understanding, and an heart glowing with love in the worshipper. If additional proof of universal bliss were required, we are told, that the restitution of all things is a doctrine which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began.§ He therefore is not a prophet, who does not bear testimony to this restitution, founded on the oath of God, thus swearing to the truth of universal bliss.

We have now before us the two extremes, the Law and the Testimony, the universal condemnation, and universal bliss, both supported by the evidence of divine revelation, both equally true; and the Lord saith of them, To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.‖ The law has been usually considered as expressive of the justice of God, and the testimony, or promises, as the exhibition of his grace; and while some men so lean to the law, in support of his justice, that they make the promise of none effect; there are others who appear disposed to support his mercy at the expense of his justice; we must receive both, or impeach his veracity. If we doubt the truth of any of his sayings, we may equally doubt of all, and revelation become to us an idle tale. But thanks be to God, he has been pleased to show us the divine harmony of all his word, and what we have freely received of him, we would freely communicate. The particular saying, which the apostle speaks of in the text, includes all that God hath revealed to man; man has an inexpressibly great, and dear interest in it, even an eternity of bliss so pure, that the eye hath not seen, nor the ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, what God hath prepared for him. It is therefore worthy his acceptation; it is well worthy the acceptation of all.

For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach. It is not possible to read the book of the Acts of the Apostles, without seeing the distinguished labours, and reproachful sufferings, which this faithful servant of the Lord endured. Five times scourged by the Jews; thrice beaten with rods, once stoned, thrice shipwrecked; in perils of waters, of robbers, by his own countrymen and by the heathen, in the city and in the wilderness, and among false brethren; enduring hunger and thirst, cold and nakedness; and for what did he thus labour and suffer? Hear, O heavens, and be astonished, O earth! All this he endured because he trusted in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men! Surely his example is worthy of our admiration, and our imitation, for we also profess to be the worshippers of the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, and as such, we would attempt to give to the world a delineation of the character of the being whom we worship.

The attributes of God are infinite *love, wisdom*, and *power;* this is all we know of him; we believe it is all that he hath made known of himself, and it is an absolutely perfect character which belongs to God only. This character of God is found in his sacred word, and in his works. In his word we are told, God is love,* his understanding is infinite.† I am God Almighty.‡ In his works we behold the same divine features; there we see him scattering a rich profusion over all the earth; he opens his liberal hand, and the wants of every living creature are supplied; thus proving himself the God whose name and nature is *Love.* His *wisdom* is manifest in the chain of connexion and dependence, visible through all creation, each depending on all; the elements nourishing the seed of the vegetable world, and bringing forth its strength; the vegetable supporting the animal world; and in the animal world, the rational and irrational mutually rendering service to each other; the ox, who tills the soil under the control of his owner, with him enjoying the product of their common labour.

Surely the almighty *power* of God is seen in the greatness of his works. As the self-existent author of nature, he must of necessity be Almighty. To satisfy ourselves whether this be the true character of God, we have only to ask, what can we add to it? or take from it? All this knowledge of the divine nature is necessary to our felicity. Let us for a moment suppose that the *love* of God is not infinite; his wisdom may perceive what would effect our bliss, and his power be able to destroy what would oppose, but a deficiency in love would blast my every hope; for love must be the moving principle, to excite the wisdom and power of God to action. Again, let us suppose that God is deficient in *wisdom;* no matter how great his love and power are, the want of wisdom forbids my indulging the fond hope of bliss; for though love desires, and power may remove impediments, yet if this power is not directed by wisdom, it is but a sword in the hand of a fool; it may destroy its friend, and spare its foe. The almighty *power* of God will not be denied by any, who acknowledge his existence; but, suppose him deficient in this attribute, what avails the greatness of his love, or the infallibility of his wisdom? He may love me with a heavenly affection, and see the means that would effect my bliss, clear as the noonday sun; but, deficient in power to remove impediments, his love and wisdom would be to me, what water spilled on the ground is to a man dying with thirst.

Look at the Divine Being in the fulness of

* Mark xii. 30. 31. † Ezek. xviii. 4. ‡ Gal. iii. 10. § Eccl. vii. 29. ‖ Micah. vii. 3. ** Psalm xiv. 3. †† Gen. iii. 14, 15. ‡‡ Gen. xii. 3.

* Gen. xxii. 16. † Psalm lxxxvi 9 ‡ John iv. 24. § Acts iii. 21. ‖ Is. viii. 20.

* 1 John, iv. 8. † Psalm cxlvii. 5. ‡ Gen. xxxv. 11.

these attributes. *Infinite in love*, he must desire my felicity; *infinite in wisdom*, he cannot mistake the means competent to effect the end; *infinite in power*, he will overturn and destroy all that would obstruct; and bliss, an eternity of bliss, world without end, must be my portion.

God has been pleased to make himself known under a very familiar and endearing name; he calls himself our Father; a father *loves* his offspring, and because he loves them, *studies* how he shall most effectually promote their welfare; and when he thinks he has found the means that shall effect the end, he puts forth all his *power* to perfect what he hath desired. The bliss of his children is the joy that is set before him, and for this he is willing to labour in the day, and late take rest at night; nor does he even count the hazard of his life dear to him, when their welfare makes that hazard necessary. Paternal affection gives bravery to the fearful, and tenderness to the most ferocious; the timid hen, who flies from her own shadow, when she becomes a parent assumes a formidable courage, and attacks even the horse, in defence of her little ones. The cruel beast of prey fondles over its young; the rude bear, with the juices of her own body, feeds her cubs, and if she is bereaved of these, gives proof of her attachment by the wrath which it excites. Does God call himself our Father, and shall we doubt his love? That he loves us, we know, but the greatness of his love we cannot fathom; angels themselves cannot measure its extent; God only knows the love of God.

(To be Continued.)

CONTROVERSIAL.

COMMUNICATION.

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor,—In your answer to Philotheus you have quoted the 51st and 54th verses of the 6th chap. of John's Gospel. I find myself unable to reconcile them with universal salvation, and therefore must request you to explain them more fully. I do assure you, Sir, that my doubts on this subject do not arise from any wish that even one individual should be miserable hereafter. I will give you a brief statement of my reflections on this subject, that you may be enabled to adapt your answer to my situation. Our Saviour says, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." If this sentence had been, Every man shall eat of this bread, and live for ever, it had been at once conclusive. But as the expression now stands, there is some contingency. "If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." Every phrase of this kind has a counterpart understood, and the counterpart of this is, If any man eat *not* of this bread, he shall *not* live for ever. Again, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, shall have eternal life." It follows, therefore, that whoso eateth *not* my flesh, and drinketh *not* my blood, shall *not* have eternal life. Our Lord further says, "And the bread that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." The latter part of this sentence, perhaps, at first view, looks a *little* like Universalism, but on the whole does not amount to it. For the expression must be perfectly correct, since he gave enough of this bread for all mankind, even, though in consequence of their refusal, ever so small a number should eventually be saved by it; for the words of our Saviour are, "If a man *eat* of this bread, he shall live for ever." His salvation, therefore, depends upon his *eating* this bread, and not *alone upon* its being *given to him*. I wish you to take particular notice of this part of the subject, and explain to me what is meant by eating and drinking, in the verses above-mentioned. It appears to be of great importance, and highly deserving your attention. You observe, "Suppose you were to give a pauper ten thousand dollars, and he was to tell you this money is only a type, it is merely outward in the manner of it, but the value of it is in my receiving it; your giving it is a trifle, it is my receiving it makes me rich." I think it very probable, that I do not know exactly what ideas you would convey by the above comparison. But this much is certain; that the pauper could not be made rich by the money, unless he actually received it; although the benevolence of the giver would be the same in either case. Wherever there is a gift, two persons are always implied; the one who presents it, and the one to whom it is presented; and however good, or great, the gift may be, in order that it may have its desired effect, there must be so much of a union, or agreement, between the parties, that the one shall actually give, and the other actually receive. This idea is fully conveyed in the words of our Saviour, for he expressly says, "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Here he states, what he the *giver* will do; and we find that on his part there is no defect, for he wishes to give life to the whole world. He then proceeds to point out the advantages that the world *may* derive from this gift; at the same time conveying the idea, that it was *optional* with the world, whether to accept it or not. "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." Here is at least a *possibility*, and even a probability, that some men would not eat of this bread. Now to say, that those who do not *eat* of this bread, as well as those *who do*, should have eternal life, would be placing both the gift and expression of our Lord in a very inconsistent and ridiculous point of view. But I cannot dismiss this subject, without making a few more remarks upon that part of it, which relates to this bread being given for the life of the world. It is the opinion of many, and I have no doubt of the correctness of it, that if Christ had not come into the world, the whole human race would have been destroyed. All communication between heaven and earth, or between God and man, must have ceased. If some large material body should get between the natural sun and this earth, and entirely prevent the light and heat of the former from reaching the latter, all natural life would certainly be destroyed. So if some spiritual obstruction, say sin, or evil, should get between the Sun of heaven, and our spiritual world here, by which I mean our spiritual part or souls, and prevent our receiving any spiritual light and heat therefrom, spiritual death must as certainly follow in this case, as natural death in the former. Now, Sir, if some mighty being should remove this obstruction, or in any way open a free communication between the natural sun and this earth, could we not say with propriety, that he had given life to the natural world, although men were obliged to make use of their natural powers and faculties to obtain a livelihood, and in consequence of a total neglect would be subject to starvation and death? What this would be naturally, our blessed Lord accomplished spiritually; he came into the world to subdue the powers of darkness, and remove them from men. He glorified the human nature that he had assumed; and thereby opened a channel of communication between God and man. Through this medium, the Lord conveys light and life, to the *true church*, on earth, and through *that*, in a greater or less degree, to all the world.

Timotheus.

REMARKS.

There is but one question to settle with our correspondent. The general observations which he has made, are rather explanatory of our understanding of the subject in question, than otherwise, especially when we look at, and examine the deductions, which *must*, as an *inevitable* consequence, flow from them. We agree with Timotheus, that if "Those who do *not* eat of this bread, as well as those *who do*, should have eternal life, it would be placing both the gift and expression of our Lord in a very inconsistent and ridiculous point of view." Timotheus quotes the words of Christ, "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world;" and observes, "The latter part of this sentence, perhaps, at first view, looks a *little* like Universalism, but *on the whole* does *not* amount to it." We however think, that it looks *a great* deal like *Universalism*, if by Universalism is meant that the *world* shall have the *life*, to procure which, the *bread* or flesh of Christ *was given*. Timotheus says, "For the words of our Saviour are, "*If* a man *eat* of this bread, he shall live for ever. His salvation, therefore, depends upon his *eating* this bread, and not *alone* upon its being *given* to him. I wish you to take particular notice of this part of the subject," &c. We shall do this; and with the more pleasure, as Timotheus has furnished us with the means of doing it effectually, at least so far as human arguments can do it. Timotheus has declared, "Wherever there is a gift, two persons are always implied, the one who presents it, and the one to whom it is presented; and *however good*," or *great* the *gift* may be, *in order* that it may have its *desired* effect, *there must* be so much of a *union*, or *agreement*, *between* the *parties*, that the ONE shall ACTUALLY GIVE, *and the* OTHER ACTUALLY RECEIVE." This looks *rational*. We fully agree with Timotheus, that without the gift is *actually* received by the *party* to whom it is presented, *that* it is *no gift at all*. Therefore, without the *world*, the *whole world*, *actually receives* the *bread*, or the *eternal life*, which Christ said he would *give* them, *it was not* a *gift!* There "*must be a union of the parties*," otherwise it will not "have the desired effect." We now ask Timotheus, whether in *his opinion* Christ, the Giver, *knew* the *necessity* of this *union* of the *parties*, the *world*, or *human nature*, and *himself*, the Giver? For if he did, and desired that the *gift* should be *received*, we believe he either would effect this *union*, or *not give* the *bread*. We shall *prove*, *first*, that a *union* did *actually* exist between the *Giver*, Christ, and the *receivers*, *all men*, or the

world. Second, That *all men*, or the *world*, did *actually eat*, and *receive*, this *bread*. And, third, inform Timotheus, or explain to him, "what is meant by *eating*, and *drinking*, in the passage quoted, &c. And, *first*, That Christ, the Giver, was united to *all* men, or the world; and that this *union actually* existed at the time when the *bread*, or his flesh, was given for *all* men, or the *world*, we have his testimony to prove the fact;—for Jesus Christ declared, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." The Holy Ghost, speaking by the prophets and apostles, testifies to the same truth, in the following clear and unequivocal manner: "All we like sheep have gone astray, and on him was laid the iniquities of us all." Again, the apostle testifies, "Christ is the Head of every man; we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it. We were crucified with him, buried with him, and have risen with him, and sit in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus." These quotations prove, if words can prove any thing, that a union *actually* existed *with*, or between Christ and his church, or all men, or the world. The methods by which men attempt to explain away the true and obvious meaning of these passages, are pityful to the last degree; and were the same arguments made use of by an attorney, on their behalf, when their property was at stake, they would denounce him as an arrant knave or blockhead. Our *second* declaration we consider as proved already, in fact, if not in form. For if the *bread* which Christ gave was his *flesh*, they must have *eaten* this *bread* when *it* was *given;* and it was given on Calvary, and the *eating* finished, when Christ said, "*It is finished.*" It is remarkable, that Christ said, he came to do his Father's *will*, to *save* the *world*,—that he was sent, or came for this purpose,—that he gave his life for his sheep, for the world,—that he gave his flesh for *bread* for the *life* of the world,—and it follows as an inevitable consequence,—indeed IT IS IMPOSSIBLE for his declaration *to be true*, that he had finished the work he came to do, *unless the WORLD is SAVED;* for he declared, *that he came* to SAVE THE WORLD! And we believe, that when Christ said, "*It is finished,* the WORLD WAS SAVED,—*the work* WAS DONE,—his flesh, the *bread*, was eaten,—his *blood* was *drank*,—the salvation was complete. We will now prove, as strong as language can prove, that this is truth. Christ said, "No man can come unto me, except the Father draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day." Is it not admitted by all, that the *raising* here spoken of, means *eternal life?* And did not Christ likewise declare, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will *draw all men* unto me?" Again, it is admitted, that to be *reconciled*, and to be at *peace* with God, is to be *saved*. The apostle declared of Christ, "that he made," not that he was going to make, or that men will, would, can, or must, make peace, but "he *made peace* through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile all things* unto himself; and you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your minds, by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death." It is remarkable, that the apostle speaks of the *work* as *done*,—done *by* Christ on the cross,—it is finished! The battle is fought,—the victory won,—the world is saved! Again, it is declared, that *he* who *does not* believe *this truth* is a LIAR! See 1st Epistle of John, 5th chap. 10th and 11th verses. "He that believeth not, God hath made him a LIAR; because he believeth *not the record* that God gave of his Son; and *this* is the *record*, that God hath *given to us* eternal life, and this life is in his Son." Observe, it is not said, God *will* give, but God *hath* given. And we declare, on the authority of God's word,—THAT ALL ARE LIARS WHO DO NOT BELIEVE IT! And, wonderful to relate, these *liars* have eternal life, treasured up in Christ, the Son of God, for them. We now ask Timotheus, whether he believes that it is possible for any man to have eternal life, except he has *eaten* of this *bread?* And if Timotheus answers in the negative, we ask him whether unbelievers have not eternal life? And if he answers this in the negative, we ask him how can the unbeliever, then, *be made a liar*, if that which he *denies*, or disbelieves, is not truth, and that which he admits and *believes*, is *truth?* We should be glad if Timotheus, or any other person, would come forward and answer these *questions*. For, as Timotheus has expressed himself, we think "they appear to be of great importance, and highly deserving your attention." Our *third* declaration was to explain to Timotheus, "what is meant by *eating* and *drinking*, in the passage alluded to." We are happy in having it in our power to do this with the assistance of our Counsellor and Guide, in a manner that shall be perfectly irrefutable. Christ told the Jews, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, "How can this man give us *his* flesh to eat?" Christ repeats the declaration, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." We are instructed, that even the disciples of our Lord, when they "heard this, said, This is an hard saying, who can hear it?" Christ then told them, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, *they* are Spirit, and *they* are life." We request Timotheus to notice, that Christ declares, Except ye *eat*, ye have no life in you. Christ declares, likewise, that he *will* give the bread for the life of the world; and that the bread is his flesh. We would likewise request Timotheus to recollect, that he has settled the question, that a thing *cannot* be *given*, except it is *actually received* by the *party* to whom it is *given;* and as this *bread* was *given* for the life of the receiver, and as life could not be communicated but by the receiver's *eating*, the receiver must have *eaten* when the bread *was* given, and the *bread* was *given*, when Christ *gave* his *flesh*, which was the *bread*, on the Cross on Calvary. We likewise request Timotheus to notice, that the *bread*, and the *life*, spoken of, is spiritual; and to bear in mind, that Christ says, "The *bread* of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and *giveth life unto the world.*" And that in the 27th verse of this 6th chapter of John, Christ speaks of the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, "which the Son of man *shall give* unto you." It is also important to remember, that Christ said, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." And that Christ declared, that the "Father sent him to *save* the *world!*" We now ask Timotheus, whether a man can be *saved*, without having *eternal life?* And whether a man can have *eternal life*, without *eating* this *bread?* This *must* be answered in the negative. We again refer Timotheus to the 1st Epistle of John, 5th chapter, 10th and 11th verses, where it is declared, that "God hath given to us eternal life, and that this life is in his Son; and that the *unbeliever* in the truth is a *liar.*" It is, therefore, as clear as the sun at noonday, that the unbeliever *has* eternal life; and that the *eating* the bread took place at the crucifixion of Christ, when the unbeliever "was *drawn* unto him, *crucified* with him, *buried* with him, and *arose* with him." If this is not essentially true, in every particular, there is no meaning in language, nor truth in the Scriptures. Christ likewise says, "Except ye *drink* my blood," &c. And we request Timotheus to bear in mind, that this is spiritual likewise; "for the *flesh profiteth nothing.*" Christ told his disciples, "Ye shall indeed *drink* of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized, withal shall ye be baptized." And the apostle to the Corinthians, 1st Epistle, 12th chapter, 12th and 13th verses, declares, "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For by *one Spirit* are *we all* baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and have been ALL *made* to DRINK *into* ONE SPIRIT." In the 10th chapter, Paul says, "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that *all our fathers* were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and *were all* baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and *did all eat* the same *spiritual meat*, and did all *drink* the same spiritual drink; for *they drank* of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and *that Rock was Christ.*" The same apostle, in his Epistle to the Romans, 14th chap. 7th, 8th, and 9th verses, says, "For none of us liveth to himself, *and no man dieth* to himself. For whether we *live*, we *live* unto the Lord; and whether we *die*, we *die* unto the Lord. Whether we *live*, therefore, or *die*, *we are the Lord's.* For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord, *both* of *the dead* and *living.*" Are these declarations true? Are not all the Lord's? And will not the end for which Christ died be obtained? And are not *all*, without any exception, baptized into his death, and risen with his life, a spiritual resurrection in Christ their Lord? This is truth;—all men have eternal life,—all men are the members of the body of Christ,—all men have *eaten* the *bread*, and *drank* the *blood* of Christ, and all men shall be raised by him at the last day, in the *heavenly image* of their *Head* and Lord;—for *in* Him they are *alive*, because, *with* Him, *they* were made *alive*,—and they shall arise at the resurrection morning, glowing with immortality, glory, incorruptibility, strength, and honour; and join the triumphant song of victory over sin, death, and hell.

We shall now notice the phraseology of Timotheus, who says, "If this sentence had been, Every man shall eat of this bread, and live for ever, it had been at once conclusive."

It appears that the words *shall*, and *for ever*, in the opinion of Timotheus, have a very convincing meaning. We *shall* select a few of

these *words*, and hope they will be conclusive. The Supreme Ruler of all worlds, speaking by his prophet Isaiah, 45th chap. 23d to 25th verses, says, "I have SWORN by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth, righteousness, and SHALL not return, that unto me every knee SHALL bow, every tongue SHALL swear; surely SHALL say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength; to him SHALL come; and all that are incensed against him SHALL be ashamed. In the Lord SHALL all the seed of Israel be justified, and SHALL glory." We remark here, that Christ declares, in a very "*conclusive*" manner, "That no man can go to the Father, but *by*, or *through* him." And we would ask Timotheus, whether it would not be blasphemous in the extreme to say, that God would "swear by himself," that *every tongue* should *swear* to a *lie* in his presence? And if every tongue SHALL swear to the truth, is it not CONCLUSIVE, that every man,—all men,—have *righteousness* and *strength* in the Lord? SHALL not *these*, *every* man, have eternal life? Could they go to the Father, but *through* Christ? Could they go *through*, or *by* Christ, without *eating* the *bread*, and *drinking* the blood? NO! Again, in the 25th chap. 6th, 7th, and 8th verses, "And in this mountain SHALL the Lord of hosts make unto ALL people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees, well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vail *that* is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people SHALL he take away from off all the earth, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." We ask Timotheus, whether this prophecy did not relate and refer to the crucifixion of Christ? Is not Calvary the mountain? The bread, or flesh and blood of Christ, the "fat things," and "the wine" spoken of? In the next, the 26th chap. at the 19th verse, the benefit to result from the "feast of fat things" is alluded to. "Thy dead *men* SHALL live, *together with* my dead body SHALL they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew *is as* the dew of herbs, and the earth SHALL cast out the dead." In the 28th chap. 18th verse, the prophet again alludes to blessings which should result from the *flesh* and *blood* of Christ. "And your covenant with death SHALL be disannulled, and your agreement with hell SHALL not stand." And Christ declared, "It is written in the prophets, And they SHALL be all taught of God. *Every man*, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." We now ask Timotheus, if all SHALL be taught of God, and if all that are taught come to Christ, is it not *conclusive* that *all* have *eaten* and *drank*, &c? The attention of Timotheus is requested to the words *for ever*, in the 57th chap. Isaiah, 16th verse, "For I will not contend FOR EVER, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls *which* I have made." See Lam. of Jeremiah, 3d chap. 31st, 32d, and 33d verses: "For the Lord will not cast off FOR EVER; but though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." Micah, 7th chap. 18th verse: "Who *is* a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his anger FOR EVER! because HE DELIGHTETH IN MERCY." Are these testimonies conclusive? If not, hear the declaration of Christ to John, recorded in the 21st chap. of Rev. 6th verse, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I WILL GIVE unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely."

Timotheus says, "*If* a man *eat* of this *bread*, he shall live *for ever*. His salvation, therefore, depends upon his *eating* this bread, and not alone upon its being given to him, &c. And quoting from our *remarks* on Philotheus, relative to the ten thousand dollars given to the *pauper*, he observes, "I think it very probable that I do not know exactly what ideas you would convey by the above comparison; but this much is certain, that the pauper could not be made rich by the money, unless he *actually* received it." We request Timotheus to recur to his own declaration, "His salvation, therefore, *depends* upon his *eating* this bread, and not *alone* upon its being *given to him*." Now what said the pauper? "It is my *receiving* the *money* makes *me* rich." What says Timotheus? "His *salvation* depends upon *his* eating," &c. It is our opinion, that if Timotheus does not understand the *pauper's* declaration, still he is *full* with him in sentiment. It is our aim to write and talk plain. When we say, that we believe that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of men, we mean as we say; and we ardently hope that none will so far misunderstand, as to suppose, we mean that mankind are their own saviours. With a view to prevent even a possibility of misconstruction, we shall instance a case to the point. There is an American citizen, a slave in Algiers; the Regency demand one *million of dollars* for his ransom. The government of the United States appoint a special messenger to go and procure his ransom. The messenger arrives at Algiers; demands the release of the captive,—produces the money,—it is counted,—is deficient to the amount of one cent, of a million of dollars,—the Regency demand the whole, and refuse to release the prisoner on any other conditions. The messenger cannot procure the cent, engages his passage for America,—is on board the vessel, the sails are hoisted, and they cast off. At this moment, a person deputed by the captive appears, informs the messenger that his unfortunate countryman had unexpectedly found one cent in his pocket, and that would make the ransom complete;—the messenger re-lands, produces his $999,999 and 99 cents, and with the addition of the prisoner's ONE CENT, procures his ransom. Who ransomed the prisoner? Not the American government, for their messenger was on his return, having found all his efforts unavailing; and unless the captive had paid a part of his ransom, made up the deficiency, he could not have been liberated. Now, if one of the race of Adam pays to the value of one cent toward the ransom of his soul, Christ is not his Saviour! This ground is strong,—this principle can never be controverted; it is in vain to attempt it. There is no such thing in reason, nature, or the Scriptures, AS CONDITIONAL SALVATION,—it is a contradiction in terms;—and the Saviour of all men, the God of the whole earth, is blasphemed, whenever his salvation is declared to be conditional. For it is universally admitted, and it must be, that God is able to save the sinner, without the sinner's help; and to say that God will not give the ransom, when he has abundantly more than is necessary, and this must be admitted, or he is not Almighty, is to set bounds to his goodness,—limit his mercy, and impeach his character of Creator and Father. We repeat it, the doctrine of a conditional salvation is absurd and blasphemous. There never was, nor never will be a man living, who could pay in the proportion of the one hundred thousandth part of one mill, to a sum equal to the size of the universe in a precious metal, which should be of a value exceeding gold, as far as gold exceeds iron. The declaration of JEHOVAH is, HO! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters,—and he that hath no money, come ye,—buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. I am God, and beside me there is no Saviour.—I looked, and there was none to help; therefore, my own arm brought Salvation." When the Jews asked Christ, saying, "What shall we do that we may work the work of God?"—Christ answered them,—"THIS IS THE WORK OF GOD, that ye should *believe* on him whom he hath sent." It was precisely with the Jews, as it is with thousands at this day,—it is all we,—what shall we do,—we will do the work of God. If the lisping infant, whose strength is scarcely sufficient to support itself in an erect posture, was to attempt the fabled labours of Hercules, there would be at least some colour of shadow of a reasonable comparison; but, to hear man, whose strongest conceptions are beggared in the bare attempt to fathom one unit of the infinity of Omnipotence, compared with whom, "the nations are but as a drop in the bucket,—and the inhabitants of the earth are as grasshoppers;"—that man should come forward, and put his shoulder to the wheel of the universe, demands expressions of disapprobation, which would beggar all the languages in creation to produce.

The declaration of Christ is *conclusive*,—salvation is the *gift* of God.—And even the belief, or faith, by which we arrive at the knowledge that we are the subjects of it, is the *work* of God. Mankind are as *passive* in the hands of their Creator, as was the *chaotic* mass, when the Voice or Word first thundered through the void,—reduced the shapeless mass to world and systems,—and the declaration of the Almighty Architect, "Let there be light," illumined the concave heavens, and with dazzling brilliancy identified his works. "In Him we live, move, and have our being; and in Him are all our ways." Man is but the recipient of his mercy; not the *coadjutor* in the work of salvation, any more than in the work of creation. In fine, we believe the Almighty God has removed the obstruction between heaven and man, and removed it effectually,—and further, we believe if this was not the case, it never would be removed by man; and the only obstruction which now remains, is the impotent folly and pride of man, who would be thought necessary in a work, on which his happiness depended should be done, and which his folly and pride would persuade him depended on his own exertions to perform, even when he is wanting in knowledge to enable him to know correctly the extent of his own imbecility and weakness.

*** VERITATIS AMICUS shall be noticed in our next.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 15, 1820. NO. 13.

The purposes of God, are revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(*Continued from page* 34.)

We have seen that the purpose of God, according to election, as announced to the prophets by the Holy Ghost, is merciful; and that the mercy of God is not limited, but that "He is good to all; and his *tender mercies* are over all his works." The word *elect*, next occurs in the 24th chap. Matthew, 22d verse, "And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake, those days shall be shortened." It is very important to understand the nature of the salvation spoken of in this 22d verse. Is it the salvation of the *soul*, or the *body?* And what *days* did Christ refer to, when he said those days? We find an answer to our last *question*, in the 21st, 29th, 30th, and 34th verses. "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor never shall be. Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Verily, I say unto you, this *generation* shall *not pass*, till *all these things be fulfilled.*" The earth spoken of in the 30th verse, is figurative of the whole world of mankind; it is the old earth, which is spoken of by the prophet. And the Jews are the tribes of that earth, the word *tribes*, signifying *parts*, which have affinity to the whole, as the tribe of Benjamin, for a part of Benjamin; and the Jews are a part of mankind, the remainder being Gentiles. The Jews are considered in Scripture as the eldest son, and the Gentiles as the youngest. Paul to the Romans, 9th chap. 12th verse, says, "The elder shall serve the younger;" that is, the Jews shall serve the Gentiles. Esau is a figure of the Jews, and Jacob of the Gentiles. In the parable in the 16th chap. of Luke, Lazarus is a figure of the Gentiles, and the rich man of the Jews; and the 28th verse of the 11th chap. of Romans, assigns the reason why Esau, or the Jews was hated, "As concerning the Gospel, *they*," the Jews or Esau, "*are* enemies, for yours," or Jacob's, or the Gentiles, "sakes; but as touching the election, *they*" the Jews, or Esau, "are beloved for the fathers sake's." The Jews, or Israelites, therefore, are intended by the "*tribes of the earth.*" The heaven spoken of in the 29th verse, is figurative of the Jewish church, religion, or worship. And the declaration, that the *powers of the heavens shall be shaken*, means, that the priesthood should be shaken, which was the powers of the rulers of the Jewish church. We consider the *Sun* to be a figure of the Roman power, in the person of the Roman Imperator; the *moon*, derives its heat and light from the *Sun*, and reflects the light of the Sun to other places; in like manner, the Roman *Tetrarch*, or governor, who ruled over Judea, received his power and authority from the Roman *Imperator;* and is described under the figure of the *moon*. We likewise consider the stars to be figurative of the Jewish Priesthood. Christ told the Jews, a "Wicked and an adulterous generation shall ask a sign; but there shall be no sign given, but the sign of Jonas the prophet," &c. Christ's allusion in this place to his crucifixion, burial, and resurrection, and the consequent unbelief of the Jews in his testimony, are explanatory of the 30th verse of this chap. Christ told the Jews "there should be no sign given, except," &c. It is the same generation to whom these words are addressed, who are described as seeing the sign of the Son of man in heaven, although there is no sign given, &c. The destruction of the temple, and city of Jerusalem, were events, which proved the truth of all Christ's previous declarations, and with irresistible evidence, forced conviction upon the minds of the faithless Jews, who could not help recollecting the admonitions, warnings, and prophetic testimonies of Christ, whom they had crucified as an impostor, guilty of impiety and blasphemy. This was the sign of the Son of man, and was proof of the truth of the declarations of Jesus. The angels spoken of, who are sent with the sound of a trumpet, are the apostles, who gathered the believers in Christ, who are designated as the elect, into Jerusalem from the surrounding country, and by that means they possessed the advantage of knowing, agreeably to the description of Christ relative to the signs which should immediately precede the destruction of Jerusalem, and the ravaging of all Judea by the Roman armies, the proper time, "to flee to the mountains." It is evident, that the days spoken of, were the days, during which the Roman army invested and destroyed Jerusalem,—and it is well known to all those conversant with history, that the sufferings of the Jews during this time, was greater than had ever before occurred at the siege, or capture of any city, and that modern times has furnished no parallel; and from the variety of concurring and extraordinary circumstances which attended the destruction of Jerusalem, there is no probability of any cities ever sharing the same fate in future. It is, therefore, evident, that the salvation alluded to by Christ, when he said, "Except those days should be shortened, no flesh should be saved;" is the salvation of the body from the horrors of war, starvation, and death. If any person should refuse his assent to this view of the subject, we would request him to reconcile the *positive* declaration of Christ, "Verily I say unto you, This *generation* shall *not pass* until *all these* things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but *my words* shall *not* pass away." Eighteen hundred years *have passed away*, since the generation to whom these prophetic declarations were made; *passed* through time into eternity, and emphatically *passed away.*

It may not be improper, to ask the reader to examine carefully this 24th chap. of Matthew, and contrast it with the 25th. The translation of the 3d verse, of the 24th chap. is not the best. In the original, we read, that his disciples asked him, Christ, "What *shall be* the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the αιωνος," (*age.*) not κοσμος, (*world.*) What could induce the translators to render this word world, except that, because ages passed away during the continuance of the world, and the end of the world would of consequence be the end of the ages. But, on this principle, minutes might be construed to mean world; and we had almost said, the world, to mean every thing, or nothing at all. One thing, however, is evident, that the *orthodox* will have it, that the day of judgment commences at the "*end of the world;*" and the torments of *their* non-elect, and finally impenitent sinners commences likewise, never to cease. We have no objection to take them on their own ground; indeed, we *invite* them to come forward, and we will give them all the benefit which can result to this mistranslation, provided they will make the *rule general*, and take the disadvantages along with it. It can be proved as clear, as that two and two make four, that if this rule of translation is right, the judgment is already gone by, and the world ended; it is *impossible* to avoid this consequence;—so much for error. See the declarations of Christ, recorded in John, 12th chap. 31st and 32d verses, "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out; and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all *men* unto me." 47th verse, "And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came, *not to judge* the world, *but* to *save* the *world.*" The 30th verse, of the 24th chap. of Matthew, reads, "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." 25th chap. 31st verse, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all his holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations," &c. Christ declares, in the 24th chap. "That he would come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory," before the then generation to whom he addressed himself should pass away. In the 25th chap. we have seen, that Christ again declared, that when he did come in his glory, all nations should be gathered before him, &c. *Quere.* Were not all nations gathered before him when he was crucified? Did he not say, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all unto me?" And did he not preface it, by saying, "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out?"

Reader, what do these things mean?

(To be Continued.)

MITCHELL'S SERMON, &c.

(Concluded.)

The brightest display which he has made of his love to man, is in the text before us, God is the Saviour of all men. Is God the Saviour? then is the Saviour, God. The common objection, made to the divinity of Christ, arises from a supposed degradation of Deity in appearing in the form of a man; but surely we will not deny to God the power of presenting himself to the world; and if he once lays aside the splendour of his heavenly glory, what robe more fit to appear before men, than in the form of man? Would it have been suitable to have assumed a lower grade of existence? Neither would an higher, for when Christ was transfigured, in the presence of Peter, and James, and John, the effect was confusion and fear in their minds As a girdle cleaveth to the loins of a man, so have I caused to cleave unto me the whole house of Israel and the whole house of Judah, saith the Lord.* Thus we see God clothing himself with the humanity as with a garment, and, in the person of the Redeemer, appearing as very God and very man; therefore, in this epistle he is called both God the Saviour, and the man Christ Jesus.

When God is called the *Saviour* of men, the term necessarily implies a state of thraldom, or suffering, from which we are saved. To talk of saving those, who are not in danger, would be an incongruity in terms; the Saviour corroborates this truth, saying, I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.†

That man bears the character of a sinner, we have already seen, and that, by sin, the world is involved in condemnation. We now turn with pleasure to the salvation which God spleased to give us in Christ Jesus; and would first observe, that his name is significant of his character. The name Jesus signifies Saviour, and the reason why it was given to him, was, because he shall save his people from their sins.‡ The term Christ signifies anointed. It was customary to anoint the priests and kings, as a public acknowledgment of the persons designed to fill these offices; the prophets were anointed with the Spirit of God. Thus we find Isaiah saying, The Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings.§ The Saviour bears this threefold character; as a prophet, he, by his Spirit, instructs us in the way of salvation, and points us to himself, the high priest of our profession, making atonement for the sin of the whole world. He is a king, for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings.‖ Speaking to the unbelieving Jews, he says, Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.** To him gave all the prophets witness:†† and we are told, the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy.‡‡ Time would fail to enumerate what the prophets say concerning him; let it at present suffice to observe, that he is spoken of as despised, and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; as having borne our griefs, carried our sorrows, wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement, which effects our peace, being upon him, and with his stripes we are healed; his soul made an offering for sin, and that the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.* He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver.† This he hath done, for we are assured, he hath, by himself, purged our sins,‡ and, the worshipper once purged, hath no more conscience of sins.§

But for whom did the Saviour die? The text before us tells us, that God is the Saviour of all men. This is not a solitary testimony, it is the tenor of the whole Bible, and if it should be objected that *all* is only a general term, not necessarily implying *every* one, then we reply, that we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for *every* man.‖ Are we asked the reason why? We answer; the grace, love, or favour of God, is the moving principle, and the character which Christ has assumed, as the head of *every* man.** This is not merely a pre-eminence of power, having authority over men; but is taken from the anatomical figure of the human frame; for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones,†† and if so, then we were with him in his incarnation, in his obedience, in his death, and resurrection. We are complete in him, in whom we are circumcised, crucified with him, buried with him, risen with him, quickened together with him, God having forgiven us all trespasses.‡‡ If it is said, that he hath trodden the wine press alone, and that of the people there was none with him;§§ we answer, that this relates to his individual personal suffering on the cross, and to the desertion of his most familiar friends, the apostles, who, although they had, each for himself, said, If I should die with thee, I will not deny thee in any wise,‖‖ yet, they all forsook him and fled, and he who had been first in the promise began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this man. The Saviour, speaking of his death, says, I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me;* and on the cross we behold, the blood of the people sprinkled upon his garments, and staining all his raiment.† Hence the propriety of the declaration, I am crucified with Christ.‡ Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? This that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save.§

In this mighty Saviour, we find the fulfilment of the Law, and of the Testimony; the precepts of the Law he obeyed, and is become our righteousness; its penalty, The soul that sinneth, it shall die, he endured; for his soul was made an offering for sin, and he is become our Redeemer; the fulness of the testimony is in him; for, God hath given to us eternal life: and this life is in his Son‖ This is the bliss God promised to the world in the seed of Abraham. To Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed, which is Christ.** The reception of this holy truth is the belief of the gospel; the rejection of it is infidelity.

But we are told that God is specially the Saviour of those that believe; and therefore some would infer that he is not the Saviour of all, or if he is indeed the Saviour of all, they can see no necessity why he should be specially the Saviour of any, all being already saved. This is the language of unbelief; the believer knows that his faith in God, as the Saviour of all, is followed by the special salvation, as a necessary consequence; but in what does this consist? It consists, principally, in salvation from a state of doubt and fear; and, in proportion to the importance of the subject, is the greatness of this salvation. How can I, believing God to be the Saviour of all, doubt of my being saved? Before I thus knew God, as my Saviour, I feared death, feared hell, and feared the devil, as the executioner of God's Almighty wrath. I feared God with the terror of a slave; but now, seeing God in the character of Saviour, and Father, has a tendency to generate the filial affection of a child. We love him, because he first loved us;* and although our adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour,† yet Christ took our flesh and blood, that he might destroy him, and he is able to succour them that are tempted.‡ Do we fear death, or the grave? No, rather do we triumph over them, and say, O death where is thy sting! O grave where is thy victory! Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.§

To conclude, my beloved brethren, let us carefully remember, that nothing in reason, or in Scripture, gives us any ground to suppose, that the rejection of error makes us believers of the truth. During the Mosaic dispensation, the Gentile, who rejected the worship of idols, did not necessarily become a worshipper of the true God, neither does our rejection of the errors of partial, or of conditional salvation, though we hazard life itself in our opposition, make us Christians. We are made Christians, only by believing in God the Saviour; this is the knowledge of the truth, and the truth shall make you free.‖

The epistle, from which our text is taken, is written by an old apostle to a young preacher, and, as relates to doctrine, is its most comprehensive and distinguished feature. It may serve as a criterion, whereby to try the doctrines of those who say that they are sent of God; indeed it appears as if this use was intended to be made of it; for it is immediately added, *these things* command and *teach*.

* Jer. xiii. 11. † Mat. ix 13. ‡ Mat. i. 21. § Isaiah xli. 1. ‖ Rev. xvii 14. ** John v. 39. †† Acts. x. 43. ‡‡ Rev. xix. 19.

* Isaiah liii. † Mal. iii. 3. ‡ Heb. i. 3. § Heb. x. 2. ‖ Heb. ii. 9. ** 1 Cor. xi. 3. †† Eph. v. 30 ‡‡ Col. ii. §§ Is. lxiii. 3. ‖‖ Mark xiv. 31. * John xii. 32 † Is. lxiii. 3. ‡ Gal. ii. 20. § Is. lxiii. 1. ‖ 1 John. v. 11. ** Gal. iii. 16.

* 1 John iv. 19. † Peter v. 8 ‡ Heb. ii. 14, 18. § 1 Cor. xv. 55, 57. ‖ John viii. 32

CONTROVERSIAL.

COMMUNICATION.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—In your 11th number of the Gospel Herald, you have quoted from the 1st Epistle of John, 5th chap. 10th verse, "He that believeth not, God hath made him a liar." I conceive, Sir, that your quotation is erroneous, and request, that you will inform me, by what authority you have altered the punctuation in that verse, which completely changes its meaning, and which is, in my humble opinion, an unwarrantable distortion.—Please to examine your Greek Testament, and see if, according to the original, the comma can be taken from its former place, and put before the word

God. I am a subscriber to, and constant reader of the Herald; and should be sorry to suspect a want of candour in you. I have therefore invited your attention to the subject.

VERITATIS AMICUS.

ANSWER.

"*Let God be true, but every man a liar.*" We have examined the Greek Testament, and readily acknowledge, that it is Θεω, in the dative case, and not Θεος in the nominative. If we had no other knowledge, or revelation of God, than is contained in this 10th verse, we should not have one word to reply to our correspondent's accusation; this however is far from being the case. We shall, first, state our motive,—and then, our authority, for what we have done. Our motive was simply this; it is evident there is a *lie* somewhere, and belonging to some body, and we felt disposed to *put it in the right place;* whether we have *done* this, or *not*, the *Scriptures* will *best* explain, &c. There is an essential difference between *making* a man *a liar*, and *making* him *lie*. Common use has defined the term, to signify, that a man is *proved* to be a *liar;* because the *evidence* against him is greater, than the *evidence* in his favour. The witness of *three* men will convict a man of perjury, and it is said they made the man a liar. But if four witnesses of equal veracity testified in favour of the integrity of the man, he could not be made, or proved to be a liar. Again, it is common to say, if a man disputes your word or denies what you declare, What! do you make me a liar? Or, you might as well tell me I lie? &c. It is acknowledged, nay more, we declare, that *every man* who *denies* the *testimony* or *witness* of *God*, does in *fact, give* him the *lie direct!* But we *will never* acknowledge, that *any* man, or *all* men, can *make God* a *liar*, in any qualified sense of the term whatever. We have instanced a case of a man's being *made a liar*, and it is, because the evidence against him is greater than the evidence in his favour, which *makes him so;* but we are told by John, in the 9th verse, that the witness of God is greater than the witness of men; consequently, it is IMPOSSIBLE for a man, or all men, "ad infinitum," to *make*, or *prove* God to be a *liar*. John in the same epistle, asks the question, "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?" The Scriptures instruct us, that "A faithful witness will not lie; but a false witness shall utter lies." And that "God is not man that he should lie." And, Paul, speaking of his hope, says, it is "of eternal life, which God, that *cannot lie*, promised before the world began." Therefore, on the authority of John himself, who says, "If we receive the witness of men, the *witness of God is* GREATER," we declare, that all those who deny this great Witness, or testimony, are liars, because they deny the truth which is testified of by God, who cannot lie;—and we repeat the declaration of the apostle, "Let God be true, but every man a liar." And of John, "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? What is a lie, but denying the truth? And how is it possible for a man to lie, when he confesses the truth? God has confirmed his testimony by an oath: And Paul adds, *it was* impossible for God to lie. The Lord Jesus Christ has declared, "He that is not for me, is against me." There is, therefore, no such thing as a neutral, unmeaning negative. God has declared the *truth;* and all who disbelieve *it*, or believe *not*, are liars, and proved so, by the witness of God; which is greater than the witness of men. It is possible that our correspondent might imagine, that our motive was, to extenuate, or lessen the criminality of the unbeliever; this is far from being the case. Neither have we a disposition to twist the Scriptures, and torture them to an improper, and unjustifiable construction, or meaning; we would rather *take out the twists*, which modern bigots and unbelievers have made, and leave them free from the touch and pollutions of Orthodoxical and Antichristian Zealots. To conclude,—we thank VERITATIS AMICUS, for his *reproof;* and confidently expect, that a more careful examination of the *whole matter*, will convince him, that we have not "completely changed its meaning," nor produced, "an unwarrantable distortion."

Note. Quere. If the word πεποιηκεν, which is translated *made*, is strictly speaking synonymous with *fabricate*, is not the term too loose and general, to admit of the definite, and extensive meaning, which is attached to the word *made*, in our translation?

REVIEW *of a Sermon, in vindication of the Religious Spirit of the Age. Preached, April 9th*, 1820, *in the Middle Dutch Church, New-York, on the Anniversary of the New-York Missionary Society. By* ALEXANDER M'CLELLAND, *A. M Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Rutger-Street*, NEW-YORK. *8vo. pp.* 35. *Printed by* D. FANSHAW. 1820.

We purpose to take a general view of, and particularly to examine the leading features of doctrine, the principles and reasoning of the Rev. Author, which he has *set afloat* in the *world*, in the *guise* of a *Sermon*. Although *charity* might *prompt*, still, we should not *feel justified*, in *excusing*, and *palliating* the *strangely* exaggerated *dogmas* and *declarations*, by *smoothing* them with the *appellation* of *Hyperboles*. We have no objection to a man's making use of a *little* exaggeration in his *expressions*, when he is *praising*, or *speaking*, or *wishing* well to his *enemy;* but, when he is *pouring* the *delicious* juice of *flattery* into a *reservoir*, whose *conduit runs* to his *own* bosom, we think it would *look* modest, if he were to make *use* of a *small* measure. That the Rev. Author, and the Society, whose *motives he says*, "are *above all praise*," mean well, we have no disposition to controvert; we believe in full with them, that the *amelioration of the condition of the human family* is an end, or object, worthy their highest ambition; and if the human family *were* in the deplorable *state* in which they *represent* them to be,—and did *their exertions* to "*emancipate*" them, bear *any kind* of proportion to *their supposed danger*, or *their* own *pretended* solicitude and anxiety, we would acknowledge, that they, at least, were deserving of a great deal of praise;—but, this, if we judge from their own documents, and we shall take the liberty to do this, is *very far* from being the *case*. We shall *analyze* this *wonderful* SPIRIT *of the* AGE!—and if, after undergoing the strictest scrutiny, this SPIRIT shall appear to be ABOVE ALL PRAISE, we shall be compelled to acknowledge, that IT must be, at least, a DEMI-GOD, if not a Deity! There is *one idea*, which we wish the reader to take along with him; this wonderful SPIRIT of the *age*, is determined to "emancipate the family of man, from the *pressure* of *that* fatal curse, which, for six thousand years, has rested on by far the greatest portion of this habitable globe." If the curse proceeded from, and was *laid on* by God,—can it be the *Spirit* of God, which is striving as the *spirit* of the *age*, to take it off? We think not!—for the Scriptures inform us, "That whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever!" Again, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." We presume we should not be *begging the question*, if we were to take it for granted, that the Rev. Author admits, and frequently declares, that God cursed man at the fall, this being a prime article of the Calvinists; and we believe they contend, that the same curse remains, and it is fairly presumable that this is what is meant by "the fatal curse," which the New-York Missionary Society is *about* to free the Seneca and Tuscarora Indians from; for it is to them, that we confine their salvation, agreeably to our Rev. Author's declaration, "That every dollar, and every cent would go far to save some poor soul from death;"—and their annual expenditure being about three thousand dollars, and it taking something over a dollar to save a soul, they cannot at present save, even all the Indians.

The Rev. Author, in allusion to the doubts expressed by some, relative to the success of missionary efforts, says, "Let us admit the assumed fact in all its extent. The Christian world *is* cherishing unfounded expectations; amusing itself with gazing on a bubble in the sunbeam. The *schemes* for the *amelioration* of the *great human family* are impracticable. Admit it all. Still, we beg leave to promise an *argument* in behalf of this *moral intoxication*, which shall *constrain* the *coldest doubter* to except it from that *contempt* with which his *philosophic* spirit usually regards *enthusiastic excitements*.

I begin with asking him, if he has ever reflected on the *redeeming quality to be found in the principles and motives from which it has originated*. I believe the fiercest advocates for moderation will readily allow, that there are certain cases of overheated imagination, which it is impossible to contemplate without sentiments of esteem, decidedly preponderating over those of dislike. When we see, for instance, a man fraught with sensibility, mistaking the aspirations of his warm heart for the conclusions of sober judgment, and, carried away by their influence, throwing himself upon an impracticable enterprise, we may bestow one thought on his too obvious indiscretion; but how soon is it lost in the splendour of his virtue! We respect the very *dreams* of such a man, when, giving way to the *seducements* of *fancy*, he *paints* some Atalantis or Utopia, some *land of pure delight*, where *love* and *joy perpetual reign;* forgetting that it is but the baseless fabric of a vision, too *splendid* to be *realized* in this vale of *vicissitude and woe*." And the Rev. Author adds, "The *object* is to *raise* to the Deity a *tribute* of *glory* from this *fair creation*,—to extend the *knowledge* of his Son, through whom alone he has been pleased to manifest his glory,—*to emancipate the family of man* from the thraldom of ignorance and sin; and from the *pressure of that fatal curse*, which, for *six thousand years*, has *rested* on by *far* the *greatest* part of this habitable globe."

If the Rev. Author, "*respects* the *very dreams* of a *man*, who, giving way to the *seducements* of fancy, *imagines* some *land* of *pure delights*, where *love* and *joy perpetual reign*;"—what will he *say to the man*, who,

unseduced by *fancy*, and free from the *Utopian bewilderings* of a distempered imagination, shall *fix* upon *certainty* for the *foundation* of his *history*, and *point* to the *indelible impress* and *signature* of Jehovah, in *evidence* of the *real* existence of a "*state* of *pure delight*, where *love* and *joy perpetual reign?*"—and *reigns unceasing*, without end, to *bless* the *whole race* and *family of man*.—Will he *respect* the *reality* of such a man? If so, we refer him to Christ, of whom, it is said, "The whole family in heaven and earth is named,—and *in whom* all the *nations*, *families*, and *kindreds* of the *earth* SHALL BE BLESSED! All nations whom God hath made, shall come and worship before him, and shall glorify his name;—and all the ends of the world *shall remember*, and turn unto God, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him: For the earth is the Lord's, and he is the Governor among the nations." And our Rev. Author, having acknowledged in his tenth page, that "*God has made* of one blood all the nations of the earth; and that all are capable of being restored to the felicity and prerogatives of their exalted nature;"—we ask,—*nay* more,—WE DEMAND OF HIM, IF IT SHALL NOT BE DONE! And we respectfully caution him, in his own language, see 4th page, not to let his "*conclusion*," be "such as might be expected from *little* and *shrivelled* minds, *pent* up in *the dungeon* of *their* own *contracted* notions.—Totally *disqualified* to enter into the *merits* of the case, and *finding nothing* in their *preconceived* maxims that *harmonized* with the *august scene* that *opened* on them, they *view* it with the most profound incredulity," &c.

The Rev. Author says, "The *object* is to *raise* to the *Deity* a *tribute* of *glory*, &c.—to *emancipate* the family of man from the *thraldom* of *ignorance* and *sin;* and from the *pressure* of that *fatal curse*, which, for six thousand years, has rested on by far the greatest part of this habitable globe." We are astonished at the *ignorance* and *impiety* of this declaration. God has cursed man,—fatally cursed him,—the whole family for six thousand years,—and WE are determined to *emancipate* him,—WE *will* SAVE the *family* of *man from* the thraldom of *ignorance* and *sin!* Here!—says this *Missionary Hercules!*—Here,—"we find ourselves in an impregnable fortress!" And as an instance of Christian humility, we are told,—The *motives* which have induced its *prosecution*, "are ABOVE ALL PRAISE." We must, therefore, be *excused*, if we do not *attempt* to *praise* them. But we believe, the "*fortress*," whether *pregnable*, or *impregnable*, in the opinion of its *builder*, will *very* soon be *demolished!* The apostle to the Galatians, 3d chap. 13th verse, declares, "Christ HATH REDEEMED US from the CURSE of the law, being made a curse for us," &c. This single declaration of *the apostle of Christ*, is *more* than sufficient to *demolish* ten thousand of these "*impregnable fortresses*." Again,—"Who can forgive sins, but God only?" The apostle declares, in the *past tense*, "Christ *hath* redeemed us, &c. He shall *save* his people *from* their *sins*,—I am God, and *besides me* there is *no* Saviour,—look unto me!" "Hear, O heavens! and be astonished, O earth!" There is in the City of New-York,—an association of *impotent sinners!*—whose "*motives* are ABOVE ALL PRAISE!" Who are going to EMANCIPATE,—REDEEM,—and SAVE, which are synonymous terms, "*The* FAMILY OF MAN FROM *the* THRALDOM *of ignorance and* SIN!" Fellow sinners!—a word with you before you go any further with *your* SALVATION!—Can you save yourselves? It would be wise in you to make the effort,—remember that "experience is the best schoolmaster,"—that "practice makes perfect!" It is *our opinion*, that you have undertaken a *job*, which *exceeds* your *abilities* to *perform*,—and if you *already* are *above* all praise!—you would *even* be *more praise*-worthy still, were you to acknowledge *your ignorance*, presumption, and weakness, and inform the poor Indians, that Christ *hath* ALREADY *emancipated* them,—*redeemed*, and *saved* them,—and that *they* are "*created anew in him*,"—and are *heirs* with *him*,—and have *eternal* life in their *risen Lord*, who *is* the "Saviour of all men." There is an *astonishing* difference between "Jesus Christ saving his people *from their* sins,"—and the New-York Missionary Society's saving them from their sins!

Reader,—Put not your trust in man,—"But trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe.—These things command and teach."

(To be continued.)

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—Experience has taught me that a work like your's may be of great utility; however, the little variety you communicate rather surprises me, especially in a city like this, situated in a land of liberty. Your candid invitations to all, encourage me to offer you some slight observations, which, perhaps, are better calculated for periodical publications, than long adjourned dissertations. If every lover of the gospel would contribute his mite of information, it would prove very amusing to the giddy, and instructing to the ignorant. And as public speakers, as well as other persons, are prone to overlook their own faults, if they are noticed in love, and not in malice, reform may be the consequence. With this view, I would remark, that public worship is an act of momentous consequence; and calls for the most serious attention of Christians of all denominations. Singing the praises of God, was an important and leading part of this worship, under the old economy; it is ordered under the new; and most resembles the worship of the blest in heaven. And whatever is the common practice of this country, this is that, which often refreshes the lively Christian, more than either prayers, or sermons. In other parts of the world, the psalms, or hymns, are commonly read line by line, and the congregation at large join in this heavenly exercise, instead of leaving it to a few, who, as has justly been observed, are very often of an indifferent character. Reading the Scriptures, appears to be the next most salutary part of Christian worship; and whether professors acknowledge this, or *not*, *they ought to know*; that if they have not a "Thus saith the Lord," for all they do, they worship, they know not what. This comprised the chief of the public service of the Jews; and Christians that neglect reading both the Old and New Testaments, disown the divine authority, and omit one of their most instructive privileges. Prayer is, indeed, a necessary part of public worship; but *not* in that *preaching way*, common to all denominations. Instead of ministers approaching the Most High in an *humble* manner, through the Mediator, do they not more frequently address him in language that *speaks their own creeds?* And like their sermons, are expressions of their own sentiments, rather than humble expressions of sincere desire to know Jesus Christ alone, and him crucified? That these brief remarks, through the medium of your Gospel Herald, may prove useful, is the most hearty wish of,

Sir, Yours, &c. J. C.

Note. We remark, that our correspondent's observations relative to that part of public worship which he denominates *singing*, being left to *indifferent characters*, is no argument why it should be taken from them.—On the whole, we should urge its continuance, *if this is the case*, as the *most* likely *method* to do *away* their *indifference*.

"*A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.*"

We consider the above, which are the words of Christ, as conclusive. It is an infallible criterion, and it was given to men to enable them to judge of good and evil. Let this *perfect rule* be applied to those, who boast of their *personal holiness*, and *say*, "*Stand by*, for *I am* holier *than thou;*" let them abide this scrutiny, let them pass this ordeal, and if they stand this test, they are *personally holy;* and if they are found wanting, they are hypocrites, for making pretensions to that which does not belong to them. If a man "*brings forth*" one evil word, thought, or deed, he is not a good tree; for we have the authority of Christ for saying, that a "*good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit.*" And if these boasting holy men are corrupt trees, and we appeal to *their own consciences* for the truth of the declaration, that *they are*, we declare, on the authority of Christ, that *they cannot bring forth good fruit.* Of what value is the "*personal holiness*" of corrupt trees, mere pretenders to sanctity? Christ, speaking by the prophet, says, "I am the green tree, from me is thy fruit found." But these "*dry trees*" say, stand by,—we have personal holiness,—the fruit is our own,—and all who are not in possession of *personal holiness*, alias "*filthy rags*," and by inference as good as *we* are, shall be DAMNED! Let these "hypocrites of sad countenance" remember, that Christ has declared them to be "whited sepulchres, which within are full of uncleanness and dead mens' bones." And that it would be more becoming, were they, like Paul, to acknowledge themselves to be the *chief of sinners*, which is the TRUTH, than to boast of their *personal holiness*, which is a LIE!

To Correspondents.

All Communications forwarded to the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter-box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold-Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.
EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 22, 1820. NO. 14.

ECCLESIASTICAL TYRANNY AND OPPRESSION.

"Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt; for the tree is known by his fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit."

Under the "title of PROSCRIPTION DELINEATED," is presented to the public a book, containing 290 pages; in which the Author, the Rev. Daniel Parker, gives a *plain* statement of *facts*, attested by *persons* of *unquestionable veracity*, relative to the *extraordinary, unchristian, and infamously abusive treatment* he received at the hands of the clergymen, composing the "North Association of Litchfield County, Connecticut." The reason assigned by Mr. Parker for his appeal to the public is conclusive. The association above-mentioned, of which he was a member, availing themselves of the peculiarity of his situation, convened themselves, and tried him on *charges*, which they *knew* to be *false*, and unsupported by evidence; and when from circumstances beyond his control, but not without *their* knowledge, they condemned him, absent, undefended, and unheard. Mr. Parker, after remonstrating against this unheard-of outrage upon every principle of humanity, justice, and the established usages of civilized communities, and requesting to be heard in person in his own defence, and confronted with his accusers and calumniators, in which reasonable request he was seconded and supported by a number of *worthy* clergymen, and being denied all redress, and receiving insult added to the most unhallowed, and undeserved injuries, made his impassioned, but impressive appeal, to the candour of a discerning public. We have read Mr. Parker's statement, and conversed with a number of gentlemen in this city who have read it, and who expressed their unqualified detestation and abhorrence of the principles and conduct of his unprovoked and malicious persecutors. We believe the annals of every protestant country since the reign of the infuriated, and blood-thirsty Mary of infamous memory, cannot furnish a parallel. When we see an association of clergymen, who, either from their advanced age, their assumed sanctity of character, and boasted purity of life and intention, and from whom the most extensive charity of construction, moderation in action, and benevolence of conduct, should be their undeviating and distinguishing characteristics; when we see these patterns and examples of all that is good and pious, setting aside, or divesting themselves of every good quality which marks the boundaries between civilization and savageism, and prostituting themselves to purposes which would disgrace the followers of Mahomet, and the worshippers of stocks and stones,—we may well exclaim in the language of the prophet, "The *best of them* is a briar, the *most upright* is sharper than a *thorn hedge*." And are, to use the words of the meek and lowly Jesus, "Wolves in sheep's clothing," who bite, and devour one another. The narrative of Mr. Parker is an *useful lesson*, and contains a *moral*, which, to *those* who have been in the practice of *praising*, and *trusting* in clergymen, *rather* than God, will speak volumes of wholesome caution, and will, if any thing can, wean them from their idolatrous worship, and absurd confidence in the *creature*, and turn their attention to the only proper object of their religious confidence and adoration, their Creator, Benefactor and Judge. It is our purpose to give a brief view of Mr. Parker's case, that an injured man may have an opportunity of redress from the candour, and his inquisitorial persecutors a just recompense from the bar of the public. And we cannot but hope, that they, finding themselves *weighed* in the *balance* of an impartial public, and *found wanting*, will reflect upon their improper, and highly criminal, unjustifiable, and unchristian conduct; and learning from experience, "That the way of the transgressor is hard; cease to do evil, and learn to do well." Mr. Parker, at the pressing solicitations of the Ellsworth Society, in Sharon, Connecticut, became their pastor. In doing which, he sacrificed his best prospects, and subjected himself to the necessity of teaching a school to support his family, his salary being insufficient for their support, amounting only to about $300. This school was undertaken with the consent, and at the instance of his own pressing necessities, and the urgent entreaties and advice of his parishioners. The clergymen who composed the association of Litchfield County, of which Mr. Parker was a member, not only recommended and approved of the measure, but highly commended him for his generosity, in assisting his congregation in lessening their burden of supporting him. In process of time Mr. Parker becoming popular as a teacher, and his school lucrative, in consequence of the number of his scholars rapidly increasing, and his remuneration liberal, the parents of his pupils being generally wealthy, and they receiving the higher branches of education, &c. he erected suitable buildings for the accommodation of his scholars, and after incurring large expenses, in prosecuting a business, which the welfare of his congregation, his own necessities, and the advice of his brethren in the ministry had induced him to embark in,—was by them called to an account, and criminated for the very conduct, which they had advised him to pursue. Mr. Parker, about this time, assisted a *pretended* friend with a loan of money, and, in the end, was defrauded by him of so considerable a part of his property, that his failure was the consequence; and in the event, was himself imprisoned in default of the payment of a *forged* note; which this friend had manufactured. Previous to the happening of this last mentioned event, the "North Association of Litchfield Co. Connecticut," called him to an account for criminal misconduct; they had previously attempted to convict him of improper conduct, and had failed in their attempt. Now every engine which malice could devise, was set at work; the citizens were individually waited upon at their houses by his clerical persecutors, and requested to come forward and testify against him; and when told that they knew nothing derogatory to Mr. Parker's character, or conduct, they were told to *try* and *recollect* something that would *criminate* him, and urgently pressed to "bear false witness against their neighbour." Members of the Association publicly boasted of what they would do with Mr. Parker on his trial; and one of the members on being challenged at the trial, as having prejudged the case, solemnly denied it, and was immediately proved a liar, by the mouth of two witnesses. This dignified Ecclesiastical tribunal, wonderful to relate, professed to act in conformity "to the laws, and commands of Christ." Mr. Parker escaped their vengeance for this time; and having brought charges against his persecutors, which, if he had been favoured with an opportunity of proving, would have convicted them of their infamous conduct, they screened themselves, by arbitrarily altering the constitution of their Association, and by that means escaped punishment. Mr. Parker, being out of the State of Connecticut, his persecuters finally availed themselves of this circumstance, well knowing that he could not appear in his own defence, and receiving the testimony of the enemy of Mr. Parker relative to *charges*, which *they* had *previously known* were *proved* to be *false*, and refusing to hear witnesses which appeared in favour of Mr. Parker, they adjudged him to be a *criminal*, and *robbed* him of his good name. To cap the climax of this iniquity, Mr. Parker was a few days after confined in gaol, for not paying a note to a large amount, *forged* by their *principal witness!* And there are now in the City of New-York, depositions on oath, of persons of veracity, testifying, that this *venerable* Association of *holy* clergymen, *altered* their *affidavits* to suit *their own* purposes.

We wish the prime movers of this hellish transaction, repentance, health, and happiness;—and we likewise wish, that we had language *expressive*, as their *conduct* was *wicked*, that our words, ignited with detestation of such unchristian conduct, might glow with evidence, and flash conviction to their guilty consciences. Reader,—the cause of truth, is the cause of God. Error,—give it what shape or colouring you please, it is the work of the devil, the cause of hell! It was error which poisoned the fountain from which we sprang,—it was error which contaminated the cup of human happiness, and its continuance is the only prolongation of misery. Every man who lifts his hand in favour of a dereliction from the mild, meek, and forgiving doctrine, established by the Saviour of the world, advocates his own destruction, and is arrayed against the best interests of the human race. We had contemplated detailing particulars of this iniquitous transaction, but we are disgusted with this extra evidence of human

depravity. Let charity cast her vail over the names of these outragers of all that is good in principle, or worthy of imitation in practice; and let their conduct serve as a beacon to others, and a warning to themselves, to shun "envy, that child of hell," and "follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." If our remarks should meet the eyes of any of those misguided *teachers*, let them answer to their consciences, and their God and Judge, for their conduct; we are not their judge, but their reprover,—we recommend them to the *justice* of a merciful God, who, we hope, will purge them of all their dross, and their crimes,—to the detestation of unmerciful men, that they seeing the abominable cause, and consequence, of such conduct, may learn to be merciful, and then they will learn to be just; for justice and mercy are convertible terms. There is, however, one idea, which in particular, we wish to communicate to our readers. Who invested an Association of clergymen with authority to convene themselves as a court, and exercise jurisdiction over the reputation of a citizen of the United States of America; and to condemn and vilify, in the most outrageous manner, the *character* of a MAN?—Not Christ!—For he has commanded, to forgive,—"vengeance is mine, I will repay saith the Lord!" Not the government, which God in his good providence has placed over us;—for they alone possess the right to rule! Has Satan again entered the scene of his former desolation; and delegated deception to aid the cause of *his kingdom*, and poison the peace of man? Or has human ingenuity, assisted by the depravity which emanated from the *enemy* of *God* and *man*, leagued in the work of destruction, and voluntarily enlisted under the banner of the king of hell?—

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor,—A theological publication, open to fair discussion, which will give to every party of professing Christians an opportunity to support, according to their ability, their own particular tenets, and at the same time to expose the errors of others, is indeed a new thing in the world. It is one evidence amongst many, that party spirit and bigotry are on the decline. And I can say, with all my heart, that I wish them a speedy downfal. And I hope that you may be an instrument in the hand of the Lord to expose error, and make known the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.—I am fully convinced, that a great and radical change in point of doctrine must take place in the religious world. For though many pious and good people may be found amongst all denominations, it cannot be their creeds which make them so; inasmuch, as they have given their assent to opinions which are not only preposterous in the extreme, but oftentimes very injurious. Of the common systems of religion, there are none without their absurdities and falsities. But in this respect, those who are denominated Calvinists, far outstretch all the rest. It is my design in this paper to take notice of the leading errors of the present day; of course Calvinism will be more particularly portrayed, as it seems to be the focal point, where almost all absurdities and false doctrines meet. The principal subjects on which I shall treat, are the doctrine of the Trinity, and the doctrine of the Atonement, as commonly understood and explained. Also predestination, salvation by faith alone, imputation of Christ's righteousness,—continual intercession,—and the destruction of the world by fire, &c.—These subjects, as they are generally advanced, are so totally inconsistent with reason and even common sense, that they have driven thousands into infidelity, and many to distraction. But there is reason to hope that the day is fast approaching, when these errors and absurdities will vanish like the shades of night before the morning sun. Indeed, many at this day who profess to believe them, are ashamed to acknowledge it; and others, who give their assent in the aggregate, deny them in detail. And it may certainly be considered a favourable symptom, that many, even of the clergy, are becoming more mild on these subjects than formerly, and very seldom touch upon them in their pulpits; and others, whose feelings would incline them to it, refrain from it through fear of giving offence to their congregations. There seems to be a spirit of inquiry springing up in the world, and the chains which have bound down the human race in a kind of mental slavery, are beginning to break, and many of the laity are disposed to examine and judge for themselves, and no longer pin their faith on the parson's sleeve. And so fast as this shall be the case, the above-mentioned doctrines as commonly understood must lose ground, for they have neither reason or Scripture to support them. Of this, their zealous supporters seem in some measure to be aware, although they will not acknowledge it, for they demand a blind assent,—talk much of salvation by faith alone,—of the total insufficiency of human reason,—of the incomprehensible mysteries of religion, and declare, that these dogmas are revealed in the word of God, although human reason cannot comprehend them, and threaten with eternal misery all who dare call them in question. But others, more mild, more wise, more charitable, less bigoted, less selfish, and less ill-natured, admit the difficulties attendant on these subjects. And while they deplore the weakness and frailty of human nature, they recommend more particularly such things as are plain and practical, and at the same time, by their piety, charity, and good lives, do much for the cause of religion, and prove themselves to be the faithful servants of the Lord. I remember a remarkable instance of candour in a clergyman, on these subjects, and for which I shall ever respect his memory. It was the late Rev. Cotton Mather Smith, of Litchfield County, Connecticut. One of the best men, best preachers, which this country, or indeed any other, could ever boast. In a conversation with him many years ago, I stated to him the difficulties, and trouble of mind which I experienced in consequence of the incomprehensibility or incongruity of the doctrines of the Trinity, Atonement, Predestination, &c. and begged of him to explain them to me. I shall never forget his answer. He assumed no authority,—he demanded no blind assent,—he made no attempt to overpower me by noisy and unmeaning arguments. But with all the mildness and humility of a true and faithful servant of his blessed Lord and Master, he made the following reply, which from the deep impression it made on my mind, I am enabled to give verbatim as he uttered it. "To be candid with you, I cannot do it. I have never read the author, nor conversed with any man, who could explain them to my satisfaction. But I do believe, that there is such a thing as true religion; I feel it here, (said he, laying his hand upon his breast:) I believe the Bible is the word of God, and given by divine inspiration, but I believe also, that it is very little understood. In my preaching, I seldom touch on these subjects, but endeavour as far as in me lies, to make my congregation good practical Christians. And whenever any of them request information on these difficult points, I am well aware, that it might be very injurious to tell them, that I am myself at a loss, and therefore endeavour to give them the best explanation in my power, and though they are satisfied, I am not."

I cannot avoid constrasting this extraordinary instance of humility and goodness, with the treatment I received some years ago, from a certain Calvinistic preacher of this city, who demanded my unqualified credence to his opinions, and when I replied, that I had no objections to giving my assent as soon as I should be convinced they were true, and also further added, that my belief was not at my option, for I was obliged to be governed by the weight of evidence,—he then concluded the conversation by the following characteristic remark. "Perhaps you will be in hell: before you obtain this evidence."

I shall now proceed to the main object in view, which is, to point out the prevailing errors of the present day; after which, I shall endeavour to show, how these difficult points ought to be understood and explained, and support my arguments from Scripture and reason. And first, then, I shall notice their errors, by beginning with the doctrine of the Trinity We are gravely told by our spiritual teachers, that there are three persons in the Godhead, each of whom is a full, complete and infinite God of himself, and yet, strange to add, all these, when united, make only one such. We are told further, that these three persons, are distinct and separate, and yet of one undivided essence. The second person, they call the Son; and at the same time tell us he was begotten from eternity. He must, therefore, of course, be as old as his Father. They also declare, that these three persons are equal in power and glory. But I never could discover any thing like equality amongst the three persons, in any of the sectarian *schemes* of salvation. The Father always appears to be supreme, and the other two completely subservient. Indeed the difference seems as great, as between an earthly master and his servants. The great and important doctrine of the Atonement, is equally misunderstood and misrepresented. We are told that it was impossible for divinity to overlook sin, without satisfaction. Divine justice, they say, required this. They also give us to understand, that this divinity is divided into three equal portions, one of which, belongs to each of their three persons in the Godhead. According to this plan, therefore, but only one third part of the divinity, after all, received any satisfaction, for they say, the Son suffered and died to satisfy the justice of the Father; thus it follows, that the Son, who is equally entitled to satisfaction with the Father, having in himself an equal portion of the divinity, gives up all his title to it, although

it was impossible for divinity to forgive sin without previous satisfaction, and he goes still further, and makes this satisfaction to the Father. And the third person, though equal to either of the others, seems to be entirely forgotten, and has nothing either to say, or do, in the whole concern. They also tell us much of the wonderful mercy of the Father, in forgiving sinful man, although he had refused to do it until he had received full satisfaction, or in other words, until the debt was entirely cancelled. If a man on receiving the full payment of a debt, should give a receipt in full, could we consider it an astonishing instance of mercy or kindness? Should we not rather say, as an honest man, he could do no less? And what should we say of a mere man, who could receive satisfaction from the sufferings of the innocent, because he was offended with the guilty? One, who would have an innocent son put to death, because somebody else had injured or insulted him? Should we not call such a man a monster,—a devil? And shall we dare to say, that a great, a holy God, has done this? One, who is all love, and all goodness?—I shudder at the idea, yet, horrible as it is, almost all the prevailing systems of religion of the present day, cast this indignity upon him. But methinks I hear him say, with the same unparalleled kindness and compassion, as he did when he was crucified before, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." It seems that our contrivers of religious systems, or bodies of divinity as they are called, though, by the bye, they are very opake bodies, and having intervened between the true light, or Sun of heaven and man, and for many centuries past, occasioned a total eclipse, and thereby buried the human race in thick darkness; I say, it seems that these system makers had an idea, that God was manifested in the flesh, or that Christ came into the world, in some way or other to effect the salvation of man, and in order to account for it, they have hit upon the plan above mentioned, and it was indeed very unfortunate, for one more absurd,—more inconsistent, or farther from the truth, could not possibly be conceived of. But they do not stop here. They have not yet sufficiently disgraced the character of Deity, and therefore, they proceed to inform us that he has from eternity foreordained whatsoever came to pass. That he has fixed and decreed every action, of every individual, whether good or evil. This is certainly making God the author of sin, and also a being that delights in the misery, and everlasting misery too, of his creatures, for he created the most of them, according to this plan, for no other purpose, but that he might have the satisfaction of punishing them to all eternity, for no other reason, but their doing his will, or what is the same thing, what he had predetermined they should do.

THEODORE.

(To be Continued.)

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR,—Having noticed the religious spirit of the age in favour of foreign missions, I was induced to read Mr. M'Clelland's anniversary sermon, delivered in April last; and, believing there is much more zeal than knowledge on the subject, am disposed to make a few observations on this celebrated production. Page 5th, the Author says, "An extraordinary and unparalleled excitement prevails through Christendom, characterized by an earnest zeal for the advancement of true religion, both at home and abroad; but more especially, by an irrepressible ardour of desire of evangelizing the heathen," &c. Now I acknowledge, that this *appears* to be the spirit of the age; and *that spirit* which the preacher *approves* of; and as Calvin, Hopkins, and Arminius, have their missionaries, who are endeavouring to evangelize the heathen, *I wish* him to *state, which* the heathen *must believe*, to make him truly religious; or *whether* it is *necessary* to *believe* all *these;* and I do think him *bound* to give an *answer*, when we find him saying, page 6th, "Like Aaron's rod, it swallows up every thing that comes in competition with it; triumphing over the love of *self*, the love of *ease*, the love of *sect*,—for surely, such zeal, if not guided by wisdom, may be productive of much evil. Page 9th, "And from the pressure of that fatal curse, which for six thousand years has rested on by far the greatest part of this habitable globe." What does the preacher *here* mean? Is it, that by far the greatest part of mankind who have lived for six thousand years, are to be eternally damned by a God of love, in whom there is no change, because his creatures have not believed in Calvin, Hopkins, and Arminius? and does he, or do they, who are engaged in the same cause, think, that when they have converted the poor Indians to their faith, it will be gospel, or good news to them? For my part, I think not; as no one whose feelings are not destroyed by such a religion, can bear the thought for a moment. Page 11th, where he is encouraging the *spirit* of the *age*, he says, that *some portion* of *this evil* is *essential in all departments*, to *vigorous* and *successful exertion*. Now I confess, I do not know what is meant, if it is not encouraging people to *do evil*, that *good* may be the *result;* which is in direct opposition to the testimony of the Scriptures. Again, page 12th, "The *wise* observer, will find *no* difficulty in *conniving* at the sin, of even extravagant hopes and anticipations." And is it really come to this, that they, who would be called the messengers of the God of truth, are *encouraging deception* to further his cause, when a wise man would not desire to be successful on such terms? Page 14th, he says, their object is the "glory of God, and the *salvation* of eight hundred millions of their brethren." This is truly a grand and benevolent object; yet I think the preacher's anticipations exceed any thing I have *ever* heard from a *Calvinist;* for as far as I can judge, by *their* calculations, that *number* exceeds all that have been *saved*, from the *beginning* of time to the *present day*. I can scarcely look at a page of this sermon, that I do not see abundance of zeal, without any knowledge of the gospel,—for in page 28th, he says, "The Bible tells us what we must do, to secure the favour of an offended Deity." Whereas, we are there clearly taught, that we are *incapable* of *doing* any *thing*, and that God hath *given* us *life*, in Christ Jesus. The preaching of the apostle was, that peace *was* made, *not* to *be made*, by the *blood* of *the cross;* see Ephesians, 2d chap. 15th verse, &c. "*Having* abolished in *his flesh* the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make *in himself* of twain, *one new man*, so *making* peace; and that he might *reconcile* both unto God in *one body* on the cross, having slain the enmity thereby, and came and preached peace," &c. This is the gospel of God,—and is glad tidings to those who believe it; but it never can be good news to any man, to tell him *he must make his peace* with his Maker, or be eternally lost. I am clearly of opinion, that if the preacher, and those who are so zealously engaged in foreign missions, were acquainted with the gospel God preached to Abraham, saying, "In thy seed, Christ, all the nations and families of the earth shall be blessed;" they would find employment enough in the circle in which they move, without compassing sea and land, to make converts to Calvin, Hopkins, or Arminius. If in any thing I have misrepresented the preacher, I hope *he* will point it out.

A FRIEND TO TRUTH.

SOUND DOCTRINE.

The following quotation from the 89th Psalm, although it contradicts the fashionable religion of the day, and *gives the lie direct*, to our sticklers for endless misery, who pronounce the words *fire* and *brimstone*, *hell* and *damnation*, ten times, where they speak the word *salvation* once; still we think the doctrine contained in this Psalm, of more consequence, and of greater validity, and entitled to greater credit, than the asseverations of all the *divines*, from the *creation* of the *world*, to the *present day*. "I *will sing* of the *mercies* of the Lord *for ever;** with *my mouth* will I make known thy *faithfulness to all generations*. For I have said, *mercy shall be built up for ever;* thy *faithfulness* shalt thou *establish* in the *very heavens*." And again, speaking of *transgression*,—"If his children *forsake my law*, and *walk not* in my judgments: If they *break my statutes*, and *keep not my commandments;* then will I *visit* their *transgression with the rod*, and their *iniquity with stripes*. Nevertheless, *my loving kindness* will *I not utterly take* from him; nor *suffer* my *faithfulness* to *fail*." Reader, what kind of reception would a preacher be greeted with, who should presume to preach this *merciful* doctrine in the pulpits at this day? What! *forsake the law of God, depart* from *his judgments, break* his *statutes*, *not keep* his *commandments*, and notwithstanding *all* this, *be saved?* Shocking! Why the prophet might as well have *preached* that *licentious* doctrine of *Universal salvation* at once. *We think so too.* And more,—if there is any criminality attached to the *preaching* of the *doctrine*, of the *unconditional salvation* of *all men*, we think that not only David is *guilty*, but *all* the *prophets* and *apostles*, and even, but with reverence be it spoken, the *Creator himself*.

* Note. A clergyman recently in this city, was severely reprimanded by a brother clergyman, for singing, or speaking of the mercies of the Lord, for only thirty minutes. *Quere.* How would the prophet have fared, had this *inquisitor*, heard him declare, that "he would sing of the mercy of the Lord for ever?"

A Question for Calvinists to Answer!

Paul, in his 2d Epistle to Cor. 4th chap. 19th verse, declared, "That God was in Christ, *reconciling* the WORLD unto himself, *not* imputing *their trespasses unto them*." And Calvinists declare, that the ELECT are *not* of the WORLD,—we therefore ask them, whe-

ther *their elect* have any *part* or *lot* in *this matter?*

Note. An *answer* to the *above*, from any of the *disciples of Calvin*, in our "Good City of New-York," would be received with gratitude!

For the Gospel Herald.

"A soft answer," says Solomon, "turneth away wrath;" and were this short, but important saying, always borne in mind with how much more ease, should we progress through life? Those, Sir, who profess to believe the doctrines which are maintained in your paper, have much of the wrath of man to contend with in their intercourse with those, who are generally termed Christians; and that too, of the bitterest kind; and I have frequently been pained to observe, that wrath has been met with wrath; "The servant of the Lord should not strive." In all our Saviour's intercourse with men, we do not find a single instance recorded, of his having returned an angry reply to the many cutting sarcasms, which were levelled at him by the malignity of his persecutors; true, they were frequently reproved, but it was invariably in a spirit of mildness and moderation; he knew, and felt at all times, that they were beloved of their Father in heaven; and in the darkness which enveloped their understandings, and stimulated them to their misdeeds, he saw an important portion of prophecy fulfilled. Would it not be much better, then, for those who profess to be followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, who, "when he was reviled, reviled not again," instead of opposing an angry spirit, to the rancour of a religious adversary, "to give a reason for the hope that is in them, with meekness and fear?"—would it not be better to bear in mind, that it is ignorance of the character of God, and the relation in which all the children of Adam stand to him, which causes their enmity? Let them also remember, that there is nothing in themselves, which can in any degree render them more acceptable in the sight of God, than their brethren, who still remain in darkness, but, through the pure goodness and mercy of God, and for purposes known only to himself, they are brought out of darkness into his marvellous light,—have been made to see that his name and his nature is LOVE. Let them remember, that their unenlightened brethren have as deep an interest in the atoning sacrifice of the Saviour of the world, though ignorant of it, as they who behold its efficacy, and rejoice in it with joy unspeakable and full of glory. It is by no means surprising, that your opponents should manifest a spirit of hatred toward you; it is the natural consequence of their opinions of the character of God. How can they be blamed for not loving those, whom they suppose their Creator hates, and will consign to misery, inexpressible in its nature, and endless in its duration?—viewing themselves as the favourites of heaven, to the exclusion of nine-tenths of their brethren, they naturally feel themselves exalted, and are disposed to say, with all the importance of the self-righteous Pharisee,—"Stand by, for I am holier than thou." But how the man who sees God as the Father of all, a Father, good even to his rebellious, unthankful children,—and Jesus Christ the Saviour of all,—a Saviour, who even for his bitterest foes could say, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," can feel any sentiment, but that of love for his benighted brethren, seems astonishing; and cannot be accounted for in any other way, than that these truths, so eminently consoling, do not at the time rest with a due influence upon his mind. It is of the greatest importance, that he be vigilant to keep them constantly in view, lest him, who is weak in the faith, and has but just "tasted that the Lord is gracious," be made to stumble at his inconsistent walk, and feel his ardour damped, when he sees how small the effect they have upon the conduct of him, who professes fully to believe them. In maintaining these truths, let him be mild, but firm,—the language of severity is more calculated to alarm the prejudices, than to lead to serious, and impartial investigation; and when once prejudice is alarmed, farewell all hope of a reformation of sentiment;—but when by a mild chain of reasoning, the inconsistency of the doctrines taught in the world, are exposed to view, in all their native deformity, and their professors are led to see that there are imperfections, and feel a wish to investigate the subject impartially, it may be fairly calculated, that the result will be good; because a wish to discover what the truth is, will, in this latter case, prompt the investigation. In the spirit of meekness, then, and brotherly love, let the believer in this glorious truth, "that God is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe," conduct all controversies in which he may be engaged. God, his heavenly Father, sees him; reads his every thought; and knows the secret spring which sets his faculties inmotion. If the spirit of love predominates, great will be the enjoyment,—and even if his efforts fail of their desired effect, he will rest satisfied, knowing, that he has done his duty; and knowing also, that the due time has not yet arrived, when the sufficiency of the ransom shall be testified to, and the darkness consequently dissipated, in the mind of his brother. Thus will he run with patience the race set before him, in the full assurance, that in due time if he faint not, he will reap an ample reward. Controvercies are too often engaged in, and carried on, more for the sake of obtaining the victory, than for the discovery of truth. How unworthy the motive,—and how much more so, when religion is the subject; and the great end and aim of our existence, are the points involved in the dispute. It appears, as if some such motive is uppermost, even when men suppose they have the good of souls most at heart, so liable are we to be deceived,—and as pretty conclusive proof of this, may be adduced the frequent angry expressions we hear made use of in theological controversies. "The wrath of man, worketh not the righteousness of God." That spirit, which in the breast of man, produces a wish that he may discover the truth, or make it manifest to others, is a spirit of love; consequently like God, and will, therefore, work the righteousness of God. Make this the touchstone, whereby our motives may be tried,—and as long as they abide the test, we may proceed in safety, with mildness and firmness; but the moment they recede from a test so pure, let us desist,—for we may rest assured, that sooner or later, if we proceed, we shall receive in our own bosoms the recompense such a misdeed will merit.

AMICUS.

Orthodoxy in Miniature.

The Rev. Nathan Strong, pastor of a presbyterian church, in Hartford, Connecticut, in *his work*, entitled "*The doctrine of* ETERNAL MISERY, *reconcilable with the infinite benevolence of God*," has the following positions, and premises, &c. "It appears that the following things are true concerning *benevolence*,—first, that it is a *love* of the *greatest* quantity of happiness. Secondly, that it is consistent with the existence of *misery*, and with *being* the *instrument* of *executing* it. Thirdly,—it has *regard* to the *greatest* quantity of *happiness* in *society*, and *not* to the *happiness* of *every individual*. The *happiness of every individual*, and the *greatest happiness* of the *whole*,—are *considerations* ENTIRELY SEPARATE!!!" Reader, it is possible that your curiosity may be anticipated, by informing you, that the promulgator of the above, *indescribable logic*, was out of *bedlam* at the time he wrote it. The Apostle Paul said, "Prove all things, hold fast *that*, which is *good*." We shall take Paul's advice, and prove the above Calvinistic *logic*. Christ has given us a *rule*, by which we can easily prove *these* things; namely,—"Love your neighbour, as yourself." The Rev. Mr. Strong, says, "Benevolence is consistent with the existence of misery, and with being the instrument of executing it." I wish to express my *love* to my neighbour,—I will therefore manifest it in the benevolence of my conduct toward him.—I will *burn* his *house* to the ground,—*break* his legs,—and if that does not make him *miserable*, I will *break* his *heart* if I can,—and all who oppose me, to use the words of Mr. Strong, "Are opposing the best,—the greatest,—and the eternal interest of God and his kingdom;" and as a necessary consequence, are subserving the cause of the devil! Would Mr. Strong like to have me *practise his benevolence* on himself? If not, it is not the benevolence Christ taught; for if "we loved our neighbour as ourself," we should not do to him, that, which we would be unwilling to have done to ourselves. The man who would make his neighbour miserable, is not benevolent. There is one position, which can never be controverted. It is this,—misery and happiness are the two greatest extremes,—and if the glory of God consisted in the eternal misery of any part of mankind, the glory of the devil *must*, as a necessary consequence, consist in their happiness,—or else, the glory of God, and the glory of the devil, would consist in the same thing. Orthodox divines have been trying for many years, to prove, that mankind could not possibly be happy without being miserable. They finally were enraptured with this *miserable happiness*, to that degree, that they *pretended* to believe, that if *every individual* of the human race was *happy*, they would be *so miserable*, that it would pain a benevolent mind to think of their dreadful situation for a moment! This was indeed a *trying situation* to be in,—*their benevolence* devised a plan to *extricate* the Universe from this miserable condition,—the tormenting *nine*, out of *ten*, of all mankind, would add to the *happiness* of the *whole*,—and these wonderful *contrivers* have expressed a wish to enjoy the happiness of being *roasted* with *fire* and *brimstone*, though to *do them justice*, they were very careful afterwards, to *pray heartily* that they might be indulged with the permission of escaping from this *exquisite* enjoyment! Is it not passing strange, that the Rev. Mr. Strong should pray to God, to treat him in a manner, which should be inconsistent with benevolence? And is it not strange, that benevolence can be consistent with endless misery, and at the same time consistent with its reverse? Heaven be praised, this abominable and impious doctrine is exposed to the execration it so justly merits. The delusions, which has been practised by the adversary and enemy of God and man, are fast verging to the shades of eternal oblivion; and the glorious *benevolence* and salvation of the God and Father of all mankind, shining upon the understandings and rejoicing the hearts of men. May the grace, or favour of the Lord Jesus Christ be with us all; and may we be delivered from the exercise of Calvinistic benevolence,—alias,—misery;—and be blessed with individual misery,—alias happiness. May the *dreadful* period soon arrive, when every individual of the human race, in the wide universe, shall be happy; and the exercise of Calvinistic benevolence be discarded from even hell itself, as disgraceful, unreasonable, and miserably wicked.

To Correspondents.

All Communications forwarded to the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter-box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications:

Philotheus in our next. Cicilia is received, and shall be published, and her request complied with in our next number, &c.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 29, 1820. NO. 15.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE UNPARDONABLE SIN, EXAMINED, AND REFUTED.

COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. EDITOR,—As a sincere desire for the knowledge of the truth is the basis of this epistle, I hope my inquiry may not be rejected, but be fully considered, and answered with candour and unequivocal argument. The subject of my inquiry is contained in a passage of Scripture, which is considered by many to be an unanswerable objection to the salvation of all men. It is this passage, or the dreadful explanation usually given of it, that recently caused a fond and virtuous mother to become insane; and in the anguish of her heart, to murder her beloved offspring! You will easily see, that I allude to the sin against the Holy Ghost, &c. found in the 12th chap. of Matthew. I hope, Sir, for my sake, and for the sake of many a despairing soul, that you will give it a clear and candid explanation. And as your paper is open to all, be not offended, Sir, if I call on the learned of every denomination, to state their objections to your definition of the passage, which, if they neglect to do, I shall impute their failure to the want of any solid reason to confute you. Many of my friends of various sects of religion, are anxious to see the passage above alluded to fairly discussed, and to have the privilege of canvassing your arguments, as well as those which may be written by your opponents.

You will easily excuse every error in this short epistle, as I assure you, Sir, I seek not for the applause of men, but for the truth as it is in Jesus.

CICILIA.

MATTHEW, XII. 31, 32.

Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him;—but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.

In complying with the request of our correspondent, we purpose, first, to examine the commonly received opinion, relative to what is called the *unpardonable sin;* and what may to some of our readers be thought taking high ground, we declare, that neither of the evangelists say *any thing* about an *unpardonable sin.* Where this idea first originated is not our province to discover, but it is our business, and with God's assistance we will show, that it never came from the Scriptures of the Old or New Testament. And we declare further,—that the *Scriptures* speak of *no sin* whatever, coupled with the declaration, that it shall *never* be *forgiven*,—and that the declaration, "it shall not be *forgiven him*, neither in this *world*, nor the *world* to *come*," never was spoken by Christ, neither did either of the evangelists ever speak, or write to that effect. If we prove these premises, and we shall attempt it, we trust the scene will be altered. The Orthodox doctrine, of a sin, unpardonable in its nature, and unatoned for by Christ, and which cannot be forgiven, will appear in its proper, and inexpressibly blasphemous point of view, if we examine the Scriptures, and admit the declarations of God and his prophets and apostles to be of any validity. "God hath sworn by himself, that in Christ, the seed of Abraham, all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth shall be blessed." And God declared by the mouth of his prophet, that, although men should make a "covenant with death, and an agreement with hell, yet they should not stand." And God testified in the person of his Son, that "He came to save the world,"—and by his apostle, that "He was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." And again, that "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." It is absolutely impossible to reconcile one of these, the declarations of the great Jehovah, with the modern doctrine of an unpardonable sin, which shall subject the sinner to never-ending punishment and misery. Here are FIVE positive declarations to the CONTRARY! And if this doctrine is *true*,—*every one* of them are FALSE! There is no getting by this,—sophistry will avail nothing here. God declares, that "*all* shall be *blessed* IN CHRIST;" this *doctrine* declares, that a part shall never be blessed in Christ, and more, shall be cursed with never-ending misery. God declares, that the *covenant* and *agreement* with death and hell shall be *disannulled*, and *not* stand,—this *doctrine* declares, that their covenant with *death* and *hell* shall *never* be *disannulled*, but shall *remain* throughout *eternity*.—God declares, that he *came* to *save* the *world*,—this *doctrine* declares, that *only* a *part* of the *world* shall be *saved*.—God declares, that he is in Christ, *reconciling* the *world* unto himself, NOT IMPUTING THEIR TRESPASSES UNTO THEM,—this *doctrine* declares, that their *trespasses shall never be forgiven*, but be *imputed* to *them* to *all eternity*,—God declares, by the mouth of his apostle, that the blood of Christ CLEANSETH FROM ALL SIN!—and this *doctrine* declares, that *this is false!* for there is a sin, from which the sinner shall *never be cleansed*, neither in this world, nor the world to come, nor through the wasteless ages of eternity. Reader,—which is true? I appeal to your understanding, and your conscience, whether one of them must not of necessity be false? And if we prove, that this *doctrine* of an *unpardonable sin*, is not taught, or contained in the gospel by Matthew, Mark, or Luke, will it not fall unsupported to the ground, and the opposite doctrine, of pardon and salvation, from all sin, by the blood of Christ, triumph in its place? It will,—and God be praised, he has enabled us to do it in a manner, that shall be perfectly irrefutable. We believe a more inconsistent book cannot be conceived than the Bible is represented to be, by many, who *profess* to believe that it is a revelation from heaven. According to the commonly received opinions, the apostle Paul must be endlessly miserable; for he declared that he was the *chief* of *sinners;* and if there is one sin more aggravated than another, he must have committed it, otherwise he could not have been the *chief* of *sinners*. We do not think that Paul was in the habit of reviling himself, that he might be soothed and flattered by his contemporaries; we believe Paul told the truth, and was as great a sinner as any of those who crucified the Lord Jesus Christ; and the most unequivocal testimony we have of the sincerity of Paul, is his declaration, that he "was the chief of sinners," and that "in his flesh dwelt no good thing." If our modern saints believed, that the greatest sinners were those who committed the greatest sins, and that the greatest sin was blaspheming the Spirit, by which Christ performed his miracles,—and believed, that the *saving* a *lost world*, all men, and reconciling them unto God on the cross, was a miracle, and that to call this salvation which was worked, and effected by the Holy Spirit, unholy, and damnable,—if they believed this to be the sin which the evangelists spoke of, and which they have been in the habit of construing to be unpardonable, we are willing to do them the justice to think it probable that they would be very cautious how they committed it,—and very backward in attempting to prove, that they had not committed it. It is our opinion, that many who are in the habit of adjudging their fellows to never-ending misery for blasphemy, if they were sensible of their anathemas including themselves, would say as little about the matter, as Paul said; and when they did speak of it, would speak of it in the same manner that Paul did. We do not find Paul venting his anathemas against blasphemers, and by inference exalting himself; so far from this, Paul acknowledged himself a blasphemer; and confessed, that he had compelled others to blaspheme. The Scriptures inform us, that "God is a Spirit." We presume, there will be no controversy relative to the definition of blasphemy, that *it is speaking evil of God;* therefore, whoever speaks evil of God, blasphemes the Holy Spirit. The declaration of Christ is remarkable. Christ did not say, he that blasphemes the *Saviour*,—or the Son of God,—or Christ,—his blasphemy shall be forgiven; but blasphemy and speaking *against the son of man*, shall be forgiven. Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews, 10th chap. 29th verse, asks the following question. "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" There is an evident distinction made, between the son of man and the *Son of God*. Paul reproving the Athenians, for their ignorance and idolatry, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, 17th chap. says, "Forasmuch then *as we are the offspring of God*, we ought not to think that the God-

head is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. And the time of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent." We consider the blasphemy, and evil speaking which Christ alluded to,—and the ignorance which Paul spoke of, to be the same. It was the sin of ignorance. The Athenians supposed God could be worshipped by *art* and man's device; and confounded the Holy Spirit, or great God, with sensible and material objects. And those, who supposed Christ, to be merely a man, or as Christ himself expressed it, the son of man, instead of the Son of God, which he really was, and who on that account blasphemed him, by ignorantly speaking evil of him, should be forgiven, or as Paul expressed it, the time of this ignorance God winked at;—and it is very remarkable, that the reason given by Paul, why all men every where should now repent, is the very reason, which Christ has assigned, why blasphemy against the Holy Spirit should not be forgiven, namely,—"Because he hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that* man whom he hath ordained; *whereof* he hath given assurance unto all *men*, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Now the *assurance given* is this, that Jesus Christ is *not* the *son of man;*—but *the Son of God!* Therefore, all who speak evil against, or blaspheme the Son of God, believing him to be such, *are guilty of what* is in our days called *the unpardonable sin.* An inspired apostle declared, "That in Christ dwelleth the FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD BODILY;" there is, therefore, no Holy Spirit, but the Spirit in, and of Christ. And he that *counts* the *blood* of *his covenant* an *unholy* thing, does *despite unto* the *Spirit;* and is, therefore, *guilty* of *blasphemy* against the *Holy Spirit;* which our translators have rendered Ghost. We now ask, what is the blood of the covenant? And answer, in the words of the inspired servant of God, it is "The blood of Jesus, which cleanseth from all sin." And as *proof* of the correctness of this answer, quote the declaration of the Holy Spirit, who declared, of Christ, "I will give him for a covenant of the people; and he shall be my salvation to the ends of the earth." And the Son of God, or the Holy Spirit, declared, that "He would give his blood, and his flesh, for the life of the world." Reader,—How many times, and how many persons have you heard speak evil of, and blaspheme this Holy Spirit, by saying, this doctrine, that Christ is the Saviour of all men,—of the world,—the doctrine, that the *blood* of *Christ*, or the *covenant*, CLEANSETH FROM ALL SIN, and *saves* the *world*, or ALL MEN, is a DAMNABLE DOCTRINE, and the DOCTRINE OF DEVILS? We believe,—and because we believe,—and believe too, on evidence, based on the declarations of the Holy Spirit,—we unhesitatingly declare,—that there are thousands, and hundreds of thousands of hypocritical pretenders to sanctity, and *personal holiness*, who, while they condemn others to endless burnings, to racks, fires and torments, are themselves guilty, emphatically guilty, of *counting the* blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and blaspheming, and speaking evil of the Holy Spirit! And what is astonishing, it is the blood of *that* covenant, wherewith *they* are sanctified, which *they* count *unholy;* and *count* it unholy, because it is *said*, that it sanctifies *their* neighbours, *as well* as themselves; *those*, whom they would degrade, and to whom *they say*, "Stand by, for I am holier than thou." It is a fact, of almost universal notoriety, that the blood of Christ is said to be insufficient to save, except assisted and aided by the *personal holiness* of the *creature*. His "*filthy rags*" must be included, or the covenant is unholy, insufficient, and incomplete! We may now see the propriety, and energy, of the declaration of Christ, "That whosoever shall seek to *save* his *life* shall *lose it*,—But whosoever *shall lose* his *life* for *my sake* shall *find it.*" How many at this day, not satisfied with the efficacy of the blood of the covenant, and unwilling to trust the salvation of their souls to Christ, are *seeking to save their lives;* and where is *one*, who ever brought forward his own righteousness, or personal holiness, as a means of salvation, but was cursed with the fears and torment, consequent upon a state of condemnation, resulting from doubts, relative to the forgiveness of sins;—well may those *fear*, who doubting the all sufficiency of the salvation of God, attempt to comfort themselves with hopes of safety on account of *their own* righteousness, in contradistinction to, and *instead* of the *righteousness* of *Christ*. These shall lose their lives,—their foundation shall not stand,—but those, who lose their lives, in the estimation of the world, and lose them, because they trusted alone, to the exclusion of every thing that can be named, to Christ, and to the blood of his covenant, shall *find their life*, to be *eternal in* the Son of God! Their confidence is without the shadow of a fear,—they know, that, because "Christ, their Head and Redeemer, lives, they shall live also!" They are conscious of no sin, that is not cleansed by the blood of the covenant of their Lord,—they believe in truth, that he is the *Son of God*, the *Saviour* of *the world!* It therefore follows, as a necessary consequence, that all *those*, who *deny* this truth, BLASPHEME the Son of God, the Holy Spirit, by denying the efficacy of his blood and covenant, and horrid to relate, *bring forward* their OWN CORRUPTION, as *equal* in *efficacy*, and *equal* in the *sovereignty* of *saving power*, with the *blood* of the ETERNAL UNCREATED GOD! If *this* is *not blasphemy*, it is *not* in the *power* of *language* to *define* it! Reader,—we appeal, not to your *prejudices*,—but to your *understanding* and your conscience, for the truth of the declaration, that men, men who profess to be Christians, bring their own "FILTHY RAGS," and put them *upon a par* with the Holy Spirit of God! Nay, more,—they declare, that without these *filthy rags*, the BLOOD OF THE HOLY SPIRIT WILL EFFECT NOTHING! Let every man ask himself this question,—Have I not been guilty of aspersing, and blaspheming the Holy Spirit, by making my righteousness, which is at best *filthy rags*, equal in *power* and *holiness* with the Spirit of God? Am I not a blasphemer of the Holy Spirit? And if never-ending misery is to be the portion of blasphemers, what will be my portion? Is there one man in a thousand, who could stand, even before the bar of his own conscience, and answer *there* for himself, *touching this* sin? NO! "All are gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable,—there is NONE THAT DOETH GOOD,—NO, NOT ONE! Destruction and misery *are* in their ways; and the WAY OF PEACE HAVE THEY NOT KNOWN." "Christ *hath made peace*, by *his* blood on the cross,"—but men *have* not, neither *will* they know it. They are *trying* to *make peace* by their *own works;* and blasphemously deny the testimony of the Holy Spirit, who declares, that *the peace* is *already made!* They go further,—they blasphemously declare, that all who *trust* to this *damnable* doctrine, which they frequently declare, is the *doctrine* of devils, SHALL BE DAMNED! Reader,—who is it that is guilty of this *unpardonable sin?* Who are they, who blaspheme, and speak evil of the Holy Spirit, and count the blood of his covenant an unholy thing? Is not "misery and destruction in the ways" of these blasphemers? And is it not manifest, that "the *way of peace* they have not known?"

We shall now consider the occasion, on which Christ delivered the memorable words, which are the subject under consideration; and we would observe, that the evangelists are uniform in their statements relative to this particular. The Jews had been reproving Jesus of violating the sabbath; and were by him told, "If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless." We believe this divine declaration, of the Saviour of the world, is particularly applicable at the present day; and if our expositors of, and commentators on the Scriptures, knew the meaning of the words, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice," we should never hear them speak of unpardonable sins, and sacrifices of *souls*, in countless multitudes, to never-ending misery and despair. We are instructed, that there was brought unto Christ, one possessed with a devil, &c. and Christ healed him, and the people were amazed, and said, "Is not this the son of David? But when the Pharisees heard, they said, This *fellow* doth not cast out devils, but by the power of Beelzebub, the prince of devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand. And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast *them* out? therefore, they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else, how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house." We believe, there will be no controversy, relative to the devil being intended by the strong man, that Christ spoke of. A man's house is considered as his power, residence, and resource. Christ declares, that after the strong man is bound, he will spoil his house. We believe stronger proof, or greater evidence of the destruction of the devil, cannot well be conceived of, than is contained in the declaration of Christ. The reader is requested to recollect, that Christ, alluding to his crucifixion, and glorious effects resulting from it, &c. said, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all *men* unto me." The apostle declares, "Christ hath made peace, by his blood on the cross, by him to reconcile all *things* unto himself, whether they be *things* on earth or things in heaven." And the same apostle, likewise, says, "Be it known unto you, that Christ is the head of every man; we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." Now, apply the reasoning of Christ,

"A house divided against itself shall not stand!" Is there any man who will *presume to say*, that the *house of* God is *divided against itself*, and shall *not stand*? Is there any man, who, after *deliberately searching* the Scriptures, and examining the various testimonies of the Holy Spirit, relative to all, or every man, human nature in the aggregate, being united to Christ, and crucified with him, and buried with him, and risen with him, and having eternal life in their risen Lord,—who will have the hardihood to say, that Christ, who is the Holy Spirit, the everlasting Father, that he the Head, will consign to never-ending misery the members of his body, and divide this house against HIMSELF? We repeat it,—who knowing this to be the case, would dare make this asseveration? Who dares say, that the house of God is divided against itself, and SHALL NOT STAND? Is there none? NONE! We, therefore, declare, that, if the house of God is not divided, and shall *not* be *divided*, it is united, and SHALL STAND." No man can spoil this house, for its Head is eternal, and because the Head is eternal and lives,—the members, or house, shall never be divided, but live also. Christ adds, in the 30th verse, of the 24th chap. Matthew, "He that is not with me, is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad. Wherefore,"—that is in consequence of what I have already said,—namely, I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, the kingdom of God is come unto you, my house is not divided, for he that is not with me, is against me, and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad.—"Wherefore, I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven men: But blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, is not to be forgiven men. Whosoever speaketh against the son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven, either in the present age, or in that to come." It is proper to remark here, that the word κοσμος, or world, is not to be found in the original; the translators substituted the word *world*, for αιων, or *age*, and for reasons, which they never have been pleased to make public. In the 12th chap. John, 47th verse, the word κοσμον, occurs twice, and is in both places faithfully translated world. If they had translated this, *age*, the absurdity would have been manifest to all; necessity, therefore, if nothing else, obliged them to follow the original Greek. We have observed, that the evangelists are uniform in *their* accounts, &c. We mean Matthew, Mark, and Luke; John does not say one word about blaspheming the Holy Spirit. But the translators of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, have made them disagree widely. The account of this matter, as *they* have made Matthew relate it, is, "that he shall not be forgiven, neither in *this* world, neither *in the* world to *come*." And they have made Mark say, that "he hath *never forgiveness*, but,"—what?—mark well what follows, "is in *danger* of *eternal damnation*." According to the common, and we might add, the almost universal acceptation of these words, we are instructed, first by Matthew, that a man who shall blaspheme, &c. shall be miserable, or damned for ever; both in *this world*, and *that* which *is* to *come*,—and Mark declares, that, although the blasphemer is never forgiven, or hath never forgiveness, as Matthew is made to say, neither in this world, neither in the world to come, still, *he is only in danger* of eternal damnation!!! The prophet David says, "Bless the LORD, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits; who forgiveth ALL THINE INIQUITIES; who healeth *all* thy diseases,—who REDEEMETH THY LIFE FROM DESTRUCTION,—who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies." We now ask the strongest believers in, and greatest sticklers for, this *unpardonable sin*, whether the redemption David speaks of, and which is the redemption of the cross, or blood of Christ,—whether this is not sufficient to redeem the soul of man, and save him from *danger*? Nay, more,—conjure up all the *horrors*, which unbelief and hell itself can gender,—base them all on a foundation forced by torture and misconstruction of the words of Christ, which you can find in this *erroneous* translation, and here is a *salvo* for all; a "balm for every wound,—a cordial for every fear!" Is it sin to speak evil of, or to slander the Holy Spirit? Is it a great sin, of a stupendous magnitude? Hear the declaration of Paul, "Christ died to save sinners, *of whom* I AM CHIEF!" Is it passing strange that the *chief* of sinners should be saved? No longer wonder; "For the *blood* of Jesus *cleanseth from all sin*." From whence proceeds the strange inconsistency, which so frequently characterizes those, who call themselves the preachers of the cross? Why at one time, stretch their imaginations, and ransack creation for mountains and gigantic expressions to make a Colossus in iniquity, whose lightest shade of crime is black as Hell, and whose strongest hopes are the writhings and tortures of despair?—why declare that such a congregated mass of iniquity is the recipient of mercy for whom Christ died, and who is the heir of happiness and heaven? And at another season, deck your sinner in all the endearing and desirable qualities which constitute the charities of social life, and thus accoutred, *plunge him down to* HELL! Such inconsistencies are incompatible with rationality,—such conclusions are a satire upon the Scriptures, and a libel on the KING OF HEAVEN!

The word αφεσιν which is translated *forgiveness*, might, as we think, more properly have been translated *remission*; the difference, however, is not material, as these words are essentially the same in meaning, and synonymous. Paul told the Jews, "Through this man, Christ, is preached to you the forgiveness of sins." We are informed by John, that "No murderer hath eternal life abiding in him;" *id est*, in the murderer. But John declares, that the Holy Spirit, God, hath testified, that "we have eternal life in his Son." Has not the murderer, then, eternal life? Is it not blaspheming the Holy Spirit, to deny this? Or, is *blasphemy*, or *evil speaking*, altogether *different* from the *sin* of denying the *testimony* of the *Holy Spirit*, and giving him the *lie direct*? We believe that any, or every man, would find it an *exceeding* difficult undertaking, to prove that this does not constitute blasphemy, to the very extent of the term. If these premises are true, and we vouch for the truth of them,—who are blasphemers?—or more properly, who are not guilty of this *tremendous sin*? Who are murderers? We answer, in the words of John, "He that hateth his brother is a murderer." *Who* are *they*, who are *haters* of their *brethren*? We answer, in the words of the prophet, which Paul quoted to the Romans, "There is none that doeth good, no, NOT ONE! Their throat *is* an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit,—the poison of asps *is* under their lips,—whose mouth *is* full of cursing and bitterness,—their feet *are* swift to shed blood,—destruction and misery *are* in their ways; and the way of peace they have not known,—there is no fear of God before their eyes.—*Now we know*, that what *things soever the law saith*, it saith to them who are under the law; that *every mouth may be stopped*, and *all* the *world* become GUILTY before God!" The word, which is here translated *guilty*, is υποδικος, *unjust*; now, according to the common understanding, or rather misunderstanding of this passage, the whole world at the last day are guilty, and as Christ has declared, that all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, and that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven in the present age, αιων, or in that to come, it follows, that all sin but blasphemy is forgiven, and as our orthodox divines would have it, at the last day, the *whole world* must be guilty, and strange to tell, guilty of the unpardonable sin, for all other sin shall be forgiven, &c. Admit for a moment the idea of an unpardonable sin,—produce your sinners,—who is to judge and condemn them? Neither Matthew, or Luke say any thing about judging, much less condemning them; and Mark only says, he, or they, who may commit this sin of blasphemy, is liable to αιωνιs, κρισεως,—we repeat the question, who is to *judge* them? The Scriptures inform us, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son,—and Christ the Son declares, See John 12th chap. 47th verse, "And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge, κρινω, him not; for I came, not to judge, κρινω, the world,"—the *guilty*, or *unjust* world. In the next, the 48th verse, the *last day* is spoken of; and it is proper to observe, that the *last* day *will* be the last *emphatically*, and there *can* be no day after it, and it must of necessity be *eternal*, as the existence of God, otherwise, whatever succeeds must be *night*; and we have the testimony of John in the 21st chap. Rev. that the New Jerusalem shall not "need the sun, for God, and the Lamb, is the light thereof; and there shall be *no night* there." This, therefore, is the day Christ speaks of; and there is no condemnation; Christ declares, "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the *word* that *I have spoken*, the *same* shall *judge*, κρινω, him in the *last* day. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a *commandment*, what I should *say*, and what I should *speak*. And I *know* that his *commandment* is LIFE EVERLASTING!" The reader is requested to recollect, that Christ, speaking of his *flesh* and *blood*, which he would give for the *life* of the *world*, said, The *words* that I *speak*, they are *Spirit*, and they are *life*. Where now are the sinners, who have committed the unpardonable sin? Is it pardonable? If not, where is the sentence of condemnation?

We call upon the teachers of this *abominable* doctrine of *an unpardonable sin*, to come forward and explain this *incongruity* to the *public*. It is their duty so to do, and if they do not do it, we shall consider them, "Blind leaders of the blind, and dumb dogs, that cannot bark." The declaration, therefore, of John, that "No murderer hath *eternal life* abiding in him," is precisely to the same amount with the declaration of Mark, that he that blasphemeth the Holy Spirit, "*hath not remission*;" but to say, that he will not have remission, NO, NEVER! is giving the Holy Spirit the lie direct, and denying the testimony of all the prophets and apostles. It must be obvious to every one, upon the slightest consideration, that there is an essential difference between a man's having *eternal life* in himself, or the joys which proceed from the knowledge of the fact, that he is the saved of the Lord, and having eternal life treasured up for him in Christ the Saviour of the world? The common doctrine, that a man *must* have, *literally*, the *Spirit* of *Christ*, *personal holiness*, and *eternal* life *in himself here*, in this world, or be eternally, or endlessly miserable, to say the least, *cannot* be *supported* or *proved* by the Scriptures. And further, if there is no change in the *temper* and *dispositions* of our *best* Christians *after* death, heaven will be *any thing* but a *holy*, or a *quiet* place. We *have* not, or at *least* we should like *not to have*, any *motive* or *wish* to *create*, or cause *disagreeable* sensations in the *minds*, or *feelings*, of *any* persons, or *class* of *people* whatever. And we hope, that something at *least* a *little* like *sincerity* characterizes and *operates* upon us, when we say, that we have but *little* enmity toward any *religious sect* whatever; and further, we readily acknowledge, that it is the *imperious duty* of *all*, to *regard all* alike, and never let our *zeal* against what *we* may *conceive* to be *error* in *sentiment* or *doctrine*, prejudice *us against* the *man!* "Have we not all one Father? Has not one God created us?" And we may add, are we not all *children* of *one* common *Father*, and heirs to one common inheritance, and destined to one common, but glorious and peaceful home? *To be concluded next week.*

The Test of Faith.

Psalms LXXXVI. 9. XXII. 27. "ALL NATIONS whom thou hast made SHALL COME and worship before thee, O LORD; and SHALL *glorify thy name*. ALL the *ends* of the WORLD SHALL *remember*, and TURN *unto the* LORD; and ALL the kindreds of the nations SHALL *worship* before thee!!!" Do you believe, that ALL the wicked shall be turned into HELL? O yes,—certainly,—why, you don't think I would deny the Bible? Do you believe that ALL nations whom God hath made shall come and worship before him, and glorify his name? Why,—I believe,—yes,—O yes,—yes,—I believe that a PART of *all* will!!! Reader,—the following is the declaration of Christ. "I *know thy works*, that *thou* art neither *cold* nor *hot*; I would thou wert *cold* or *hot*.—So then, *because* thou art *luke-warm*, and *neither cold nor hot*, I will SPUE THEE OUT OF MY MOUTH!"

CONTROVERSIAL.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Philotheus has been honoured by the attention paid to his opinions, queries, and nquiries,—but as he had no intention of engaging in a controversy, when he made his appearance, he rather declines controverting the answer of the Editor.—

Philotheus has noticed, that the Editor's tenor of *arguing* and quoting Scriptures, proves pretty clearly, he is a *necessarian*;—and in his answer to Timotheus, he expressly announces, that the idea of conditional salvation, is absurd and blasphemous. The scriptures are replete with conditions.

Will he be so kind as to inform his readers, whether Adam the first, was created a free agent, or a necessary being? If the latter;—please to explain why God necessitated him to sin, and apostatize from that good, upright and happy condition, in which he created him. For I confess, I do not see how it is possible for such a necessary being to sin or fall. Yet it is too evident that men are sinners; and that the world, once good, now lieth in wickedness.

If it is said, that man was created with the noble gifts of free agency and accountability, (which are necessarily connected,)—has man, by misusing his free-will power so lost this gift of free-agency, with accountability, that the coming of Jesus Christ has not restored them?

A lucid explanation of these things are fundamental inquiries, in regard to the apostacy and restoration of man, to that image, Jesus Christ, in which man is said to have been created.

The necessarian principle appears to have induced the Editor to misapply and misinterpret, as Philotheus apprehends, most of the texts, with which he has endeavoured to confute.

PHILOTHEUS.

P. S. I was sorry to observe, that the Editor did not testify, manifest or demonstrate, that Jesus Christ was his Captain, Counsellor, and Guide, by any *immediate* communication and presence; in this gospel day of the outward word, in which God promised by Joel to pour out his Spirit on all flesh.

REMARKS.

We should have been better pleased, had Philotheus given to his objections, an *arrangement* and *name;* and we think that we are justified in expressing dissatisfaction, especially, when it is considered, that he has *not quoted one testimony* from the Scriptures in proof of, or to *justify* him in *his objections*, &c. However, it is not so properly our province to disprove the *manner*, as the *matter;* and in doing the latter, we have no other motive, than to convince our friend of the inconsistency of his principles and doctrines with the Scriptures, and as a consequence, induce him to embrace the truth. Is it not very remarkable, that Philotheus, who declares, that "he had no intention of engaging in a controversy, when he made his appearance; and that he rather *declines controverting* the answer of the Editor," should *immediately* attempt to *controvert*, by giving *his naked* declaration against the *positive* and numerous declarations of the Scriptures? We say *naked* declaration, for it is *bare*, and destitute of every thing which *deserves* the name of *proof*, save Philotheus', *own* authority; and we must be excused *admitting his* testimony as *evidence*, whenever it disagrees with the word of God.

Philotheus, adverting to our declaration, in our remarks on Timotheus, that "The idea of a *conditional* salvation is absurd and blasphemous," says, "The *Scriptures* are *replete* with *conditions*." We *challenge* him to *produce* ONE! And to prevent misconstruction, we declare, that the *Scriptures* do not *require* of man, ONE *act*, or *deed*, as a *condition*, in *default* of which *performance*, his *soul* shall be *endlessly miserable*,—or in *compliance* with *which*, *his soul* shall be made *endlessly happy* in the enjoyment of eternal life. Let it be understood, that if there is a *condition*, it *must* of *necessity*, be a "SINE QUA NON,"—and it must be *definite*,—and whether Philotheus, or *any other* person, *controverts* our *declaration*, we shall *insist*, that *he*, or *they*, shall *point out* the *condition*, or *conditions;* and that *it*, or *they*, must be *definite;*—this *shall be* a "SINE QUA NON," likewise. There is now an opportunity for the *believers* in a *conditional salvation*, to come forward, and *prove* it such; and if *they decline*,—we shall consider them as acknowledging, that their doctrine of conditions is indefensible and unsupported by Scripture,—and if they come forward, and will take the WORD OF GOD IN EVIDENCE, *we pledge ourselves to prove it* FALSE!

Philotheus has introduced, what, to us, is a new name for a *sect;* he says, "he has noticed, that the Editor's *tenor* of arguing and quoting the scriptures, *proves* pretty clearly, that he is a NECESSARIAN." We have heard of *Fatalists*, and Predestinarians, and if the Necessarian is a *convertible* term for *either* of *these*, we shall plead *not guilty*. We, however, have no hesitation relative to declaring what to us appears to be truth; and have no anxiety about consequences; for it is of little moment what we are described to be, by those, who are not sufficiently informed of our faith, to know themselves. If the word *necessary*, is defined to be *fit*, *proper*, and *best*, we have no objection to the *appellation*, for we believe it fit, and proper, and best, and necessary, that we should be something or other, otherwise, we believe, we never should have been.

We shall now *answer*, and we hope in a satisfactory manner, the *questions* of Philotheus. And, *first*,—"Whether Adam the first, was created a free agent, or a necessary being?" *Ans.* BOTH! *Proof.* God *made* man in *his* own *image*, and made him upright. God is a free agent,—therefore, man *could not* be *in* the *image* of *God*, without being a free agent likewise,—free agency,—uprightness, and to be in the image of God, are convertible terms; it is impossible to possess *one*, without possessing all the *three*,—and it is impossible to lose *one*, without losing all *three*. Let it not be understood, that we should say, that God was under the necessity of creating Adam,—the word necessity, or necessary, may apply to man, definitely, but not to God. God is infinite, and we are finite, and words are finite, otherwise we could not understand their meaning. And when we say, that Adam was a free agent, and a necessary being, we mean, that it was *fit*, and *proper*, and *best*, that Adam should *be*, or God would not have *created* him; therefore, Adam was a necessary being. That Adam, by the fall, and his posterity in, with, and by him, lost his, and their *image of* God, we presume will not be denied by any, who pretend to the name of Christian, of any sect whatever. If these premises are true, and we shall take it for granted they are until they are controverted, we think it *unnecessary* to give any other answer to the second question, in the third paragraph, of Philotheus' communication, &c.

Philotheus, in his fourth paragraph, *interrogates*, "Has man by misusing his free-will power, so lost this gift of free agency, with accountability, that the coming of Jesus Christ has not restored them? and adds, a lucid explanation of these things are fundamental inquiries, in regard to the apostacy and restoration of man, to that image, Jesus Christ, in which man is said to have been created." *Ans.* The Scriptures are explicit, and inform us, that *all died in Adam;* and as men by dying, lose the powers which depended upon their natural life, so *all men* by dying in Adam, lost the *uprightness*, the *image* and *free agency*, which they possessed in Adam, before he, *Adam*, or *they* fell, and died. The Scriptures are positive in their declarations, relative to the fact, "That *all are under sin*; As it is written, there is *none righteous*, NO, NOT ONE! *There is* NONE THAT UNDERSTANDETH, there is *none* that *seeketh* after God. *They are* ALL GONE OUT *of the way*, they are together become unprofitable; THERE IS NONE THAT DOETH GOOD, NO, NOT ONE!" Romans, 3d chap. We now ask Philotheus, and we hope he will answer, whether a *man*, who *has no understanding*, is a *free agent?* And whether *any* of the race of Adam, *all men*, or *any* of them, *can possibly* be *saved*, if *salvation* is *conditional*, and the *condition* is GOOD WORKS, in any shape whatever? And further, we declare, without any, the least hesitation, that whenever Philotheus, proves salvation to be conditional, one of two things *must* be admitted, *namely*, that ALL MANKIND WITHOUT EXCEPTION MUST BE ETERNALLY DAMNED, or the APOSTLE IS A LIAR! This can never be controverted. Philotheus' question, whether "man, by misusing his free-will power, has so lost the gift of free-agency with accountability, that the coming of Jesus Christ has not restored them," obliges us to ask, which coming of Jesus Christ he refers to? The reader will recollect, that Philotheus, in his former communication, spoke of the *first*, and *second* appearing of Christ.* If, according to Philotheus, the second appearing of Christ, *restores* man to his *accountability*, &c. we do not see any bearing the subject in this shape can have upon mankind universally. But, if Philotheus refers to the *first*, coming of Christ, it does. We therefore consider the *question* in this *light*, and *answer*, "*As in Adam* all *die*, even *so in* Christ *shall all* be *made alive*." If Philotheus believes this to be truth, he must acknowledge, that as many as died in Adam shall be made alive in Christ, and if the loss of the image of God took place, when all died in Adam, the restoration to that image, will take place when they are made alive in Christ. We have the testimony of Paul, that "we are dead, and our life is hid with Christ in God;" and of John, that "we have eternal life in the Son of God." Paul likewise declares, that "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we must also bear the image of the heavenly." And Paul adds, "Brethren, flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall *not all sleep*, but *we shall all be changed*, in a moment," &c. One question will settle this part of our subject; will not those who are changed, be changed to the image of God, which was lost in the person of Adam by transgression? We believe Philotheus would hesitate a little before he answered this question in the negative; and if answered in the affirmative, Paul settles the question, beyond the possibility of misconstruction, to a candid, honest mind, relative to the number who are to be restored, &c. We declare, that *all*, *every one*, shall be restored. And *if* we are in an error, it is the same error which God, and all his holy prophets were in, when *they* "testified of the restitution of all things." The concluding paragraph in Philotheus' communication reads thus, "The *necessarian* principle appears to have induced the Editor to misapply and misinterpret, as Philotheus apprehends, *most* of the texts, with which he has endeavoured to confute Philotheus." We presume to say, that Philotheus has *apprehended very wrong*, and we think so important a *question*, demands *something more*, than the *naked* affirmation, or *mere apprehension* of Philotheus to disprove it. The P. S. at the bottom of our correspondent's communication, is, a part of it at least, so obscure, that we candidly confess we cannot understand it. Relative to that part of it, however, which expresses sorrow, that we "did not *testify*, *manifest*, or *demonstrate*, that Jesus Christ is our Captain, Counsellor, and Guide;" we plead *not* guilty. We testified to the fact, by positive affirmations, or declarations; and manifested our subjection to our Captain and Guide, by using every argument, and urging the commands of our Captain and Guide, to the acceptance of Philotheus, as infinitely preferable to all human deductions, principles, or doctrines. To conclude,—we think the *apprehensions* of Philotheus are *unworthy* the name of *proof*, when put in *competition* with the numerous and positive *testimonies* of the *Captain* of our salvation, which we have adduced in *evidence* of the TRUTH!

* Note. Philotheus believes, that Christ comes the second time in the flesh of his people, in this world, and converts or renews them to a state of sinless perfection. But as *we* should understand it, to be *perfect*, good, *sinners!* For they continue to *sin*, only they sin *better* than *wicked* men do!

To Correspondents.

Veritatis Amicus, and Halcyon is received, and shall appear in our next.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 5, 1820. NO. 16.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE UNPARDONABLE SIN, EXAMINED AND REFUTED.

(Concluded.)

Is that *spirit* which is abroad in the world, that spirit of *pride*, of *hatred*, *religious hatred!* that *spirit* of *hatred* which the apostle of Christ declares, is the *spirit* of *murder*,—or *constitutes* the man who *possesses* it a *murderer*,—is this *spirit* to be set on high, and every one *anathematized* who will not *bend* the *knee*, or what is the same, or worse, dignify it with the *blasphemous* appellation of the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit? Shall we "call evil good, and good evil;—light darkness, and darkness light? Shall every principle which has any foundation to produce confidence; every sentiment which can inspire charity,—and that faith which alone can create love,—and that doctrine which can make that love universal in its operation,—shall *all these* be sacrificed at the shrine of a demon, whose temple is ingulphed in an ocean of blood, the oblations of his worshippers?—whose *justice* is *cruelty*, and whose *mercy* favouritism? who is approached with fear, loved without affection, and served from necessity; who rewards without merit; and damns without crime?—whose reign is terror, whose frown is destruction,—and whose displeasure is damnation and misery? No, NEVER! As far as the east is from the west, so far is this spirit removed from the mild and forgiving Spirit of Christ. We are commanded by the Holy Spirit to forgive our enemies, and do them good; to be perfect, as our Father in heaven is perfect. Does the perfection of God consist in, or is it characterized by the forgiveness of his enemies? Let us for a moment suppose, that a man who had committed what is called the unpardonable sin, should offend his neighbour, if his neighbour forgave him, and God his Creator punished him for ever, without end, who would manifest the most forgiving and merciful disposition? Is it reasonable for one moment to suppose, that God would command his creatures to do that, which should be unjust, and the reverse of good? No! And if God commands his creatures to forgive their enemies, because it is good, will not God do good likewise, and forgive his enemies? Reader,—would it not be blasphemous to answer this in the negative? And if answered in the affirmative, does it not destroy the doctrine of an unpardonable sin? From what has been said, we think it obvious, that the sin against the Holy Ghost is easily defined, and is far from being enveloped in the mystery, which the fears, doubts and unbelief of the world have covered it. There is no medium between good and evil. It is impossible for a neutrality to exist in this thing; and it is evident, that a man who has no knowledge of a Holy Spirit, cannot speak evil of the Holy Spirit. Christ has defined blasphemy to be evil speaking; and every thing being evil that is not good, and every thing being falsehood, that is not truth; every man, therefore, who speaks of the Holy Spirit, or God, or Christ, and attributes to the Holy Spirit, who is God and Christ, evil, either of intention, or in any manner whatever, is emphatically guilty of that blasphemy,—and has no forgiveness, or remission of sin, whether he blasphemed or spoke evil of the Holy Spirit during the age in which this declaration was made, or in any age, future from and posterior to that age. It is our opinion, that ninety-nine mistakes out of an hundred, of all that men are guilty of, in their opinions of the character and purposes of the Deity, proceed from judging of him, by the same standard, or criterion by which they judge of, or estimate the ways of men. God has declared by his prophet, that, "As the heavens are high above the earth, so are his ways above their ways, and his thoughts above their thoughts." God has revealed himself to his creatures in the character of their Father; and as much higher as the heavens are above the earth, so much does his love and affection exceed the love and affection of an earthly father. God, our heavenly Father, has declared, that "He will not cast off for ever, that he will not be always wroth; but out of the *multitude of his mercies*, he will have compassion, for he doth not *afflict willingly*, nor *grieve* the children of men." And this *tender* and *affectionate* Father has declared, that, although "a *mother* may *forget*, he never will forget." God has even "Sworn by himself, that he would bless all the families and kindreds of the earth." And, as though this were not enough, condescended to "rend the heavens and come down," and assuming the nature of his creatures and offspring, the race of Adam, to give them ocular demonstration of his love and affection for them, by bearing the revilings and reproaches of his ignorant deluded creatures, and pouring out his blood on the cross to reconcile them to himself. But his people, more ignorant than the ox and the ass, did not know nor consider. This demonstration of Almighty love, is either degraded by conditions, or restricted to a favoured few; the purposes of God are evil spoken of, and his designs stigmatized with a cruelty, which would disgrace an adversary.

It must be obvious to the reader, that to be judged, is very different from being condemned, or proved *guilty;* or as Mark, by our translators has been made to say, to be damned. The evangelist Matthew, in this 12th chap. of his gospel, quotes the words of the prophet relative to Christ, and the end for which he came into the world and suffered, and rose from the dead. It is well worth the reader's attention, and is far from supporting the modern doctrine, that sin is unpardonable. "Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased; I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall shew *judgment*, κρισιν, (the same word which is translated *damnation*,) to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment, κρισιν (translated damnation in Mark) unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust." In the 36th verse, we read, "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in *the* day of *judgment*." The same *word* which is translated *damnation* in Mark, &c. The reader is requested to note, the word *the*, as used in this 36th verse; in the English language, it is a definitive article; in the original, the Greek definitive article is not used, it is *a* day of Judgment. We think the 18th, 20th, and 21st verses, of this same 12th chap. are explanatory of this judgment, &c. The accounts given of the declaration of Christ, relative to the forgiveness of sins, by the evangelists Matthew, Mark, and Luke, are in harmony; and so far from containing any thing to *distress* or *afflict* mankind, are, *if understood*, a source of *rich* consolation. They are in perfect consistency with the whole tenor of Revelation; and are explanatory of the evil of sin, agreeable to Paul's declaration, "Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile." The Scriptures likewise instruct us, "Through Christ is preached the remission of sins; and that *by him*, all who believe, are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." We consider the declaration of Christ as explanatory of the blessings of his salvation; and is an emphatic, and conclusive answer, to all those, who declare, that if the "Doctrine of the salvation of all men is true, there is no need of preaching, or making it known." The man who believes the testimony of the Holy Spirit, who testifies, that "*We have eternal life in the Son of God*," experiences the truth of the saying of Christ, "That all manner of sin and blasphemy *shall* be forgiven unto men;" and knows, to use the words of Paul, "that he is justified from all things." This is the necessary consequence of a *cause*,—the *cause* is *faith* in the *promises* of God, the Holy Spirit, that *all* are created anew in Christ, and have *risen in* and *with their* risen and triumphant Lord. They have, therefore, *forgiveness*, or *remission* of their sins; and ever will have in every age. On the other hand, in every age, all those whose minds are convinced of the truth of the existence of a Holy Spirit, but are ignorant of his character, and seeking salvation by the works of the law, or by their own righteousness, are in the *flesh*, and blaspheming the Holy Spirit, by denying that the Holy Spirit is the Saviour of the *world*, and *only* the Saviour of a *part*, whose personal holiness make it *possible* and *consistent* with him to *save* them, and *measuring their hopes* of salvation by *their* own *merit* and *righteousness*, instead of the *Holy Spirit*, the Redeemer, they *have not forgiveness*; neither did those have during the age when these words were spoken by Christ, or in any age since, neither will *any such* have in any future age; but emphatically experience the truth of the declaration of Christ, as recorded by Mark, they "have not forgiveness in this αιων, or age, but

are liable to a judgment, *αιωνιε*, during the age; and are evidences of the truth of Paul's declaration, that *from* their *own works* under, or in conformity to the *law* of Moses, they cannot be *justified* from *their* sins.

We have carefully *searched* the Scriptures, and *firmly* and *immoveably*, and without a *doubt* BELIEVE,—that the exposition we have, by *God's assistance*, given of the declaration of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as recorded by his disciples Matthew, Mark, and Luke, is TRUTH! And will be *proved* such,—when the *traditions* of *men*, and the *delusions* of the *adversary*, which now *distract* the world with *doubts* and *fears*, will be *buried* beneath the *ruins* and *distractions* of *time*, and *forgotten* amid the splendours of a glorious, triumphant, and happy ETERNITY!

Note. *Quere.* Suppose a man was to be *punished* ONE *minute* for a *crime* which he had committed, could it then be said with propriety, that the *man* was pardoned or *forgiven?*—Is punishment intended to make the punished *better*, or *worse?*—If intended to make him *better*, when will he reap the *advantage* from the *punishment*, if he is *punished* for ever, without end? And if *punishment* does not *benefit* the *punished*, what is it *good* for? The Scriptures inform us, that the "Lord chasteneth every son whom he loveth,—and if ye are without *chastening*, of which *all are partakers*, ye are *bastards*, and not *sons!*"

EXPLANATION.

A Friend suggested to us, that the declaration in our last Number, in our answer to Cicilia, "*The blood of the eternal uncreated God*," was by some misunderstood, &c. We consider the Scriptures to be explicit in their declarations relative to the one only living and true God, "rending the heavens and coming down," assuming our flesh, and our nature, and redeeming us by his blood, and cleansing us from all sin. And God manifest, or known in the flesh, declared, speaking of his flesh and blood, given for the life of the world, "The words that I speak, they are SPIRIT, and they are life. God is a Spirit,—God is one God,—beside him there is no Saviour,"—and he has declared, "I will not give my glory to another!"

COMMUNICATION.

RELIGION.

A religious life has generally been considered by those who are called orthodox, to be compounded of alternate scenes of doubt, of gloomy melancholy, and the reviving rays of returning hope. These self-styled orthodox Christians, are sometimes represented as gliding upon the smooth, and almost unruffled surface of the ocean of time, with their evidence increased, and their prospect brightened of landing safe on the blissful shores of that river of delight, which flows from the right hand of God for ever. But behold, the scene is suddenly changed; the evidences sink, apparently to rise no more,—their prospect becomes shrouded in the sable habiliment of night,—their hopes are tossed high on the broken billows of doubt, and the surging waves of fear and despair ultimately overwhelm them in an ocean of misery. Now, behold them, ten times more the children of hell, than they were before they became proselytes. Reader, such is the history of my own religious experience. I became a convert to the Calvinistic doctrine, and for a season, I fancied myself one of the "*favoured chosen few.*" But gathering clouds of doubt began to rise, I began to fear that I was deceiving myself,—perhaps I was one of the non-elect, and in the broad and beaten road to endless misery. I doubted, feared, and had torment; and was ten times more the child of hell, or suffering, than I was before I became a proselyte. The man who is raised from indigence to the possession of affluence, if he by misfortune should become reduced to penury, feels ten times more dejected than he would, if he had never lived in the enjoyment of wealth. After being thus afflicted, my prospect sometimes brightened, my faith increased, my hope became strengthened, and the calm sunshine of peace for a season seemed to pervade my soul. But this short season of rest was soon followed by far stronger, and more alarming fear; and I thus experienced the truth of the Scriptures, which declare, that "He that doubteth is damned." Doubts and fears on the subject of religion, are said by those who are called orthodox, to be strong evidence of our being chosen and accepted of God, and being born again. Those who receive this evidence, must, certainly, either have forgotten, or never saw the preceding quotation. But ever blessed be the name of Jesus, I have by his grace been taught, and learned to "trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men,"—I have no confidence in the flesh, nor in the visions and fanciful imaginations of a disturbed brain. My hope is in him, who hath promised and sworn by himself, because he could swear by no greater, "That unto him *every knee* should bow, *every tongue* should swear, and *surely should say, in the Lord* have *I righteousness* and strength." In the gospel according to John, 6th chap. and 45th verse, the Saviour says, "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." Therefore, when the whole human family are taught of God, they will come to the Saviour, and he hath declared, "They that come to me I will in no wise cast out." Being instructed by the Father, they will place implicit confidence in Jesus the Saviour of the world. Then faith and hope, their all, will be centred in him; seeing the beauty and exceeding excellency of his character, they will love him supremely,—and we know, saith the apostle, "that all things shall work together for good, to them that love God." The person who views all the dispensations of Providence working together for good, is prepared to run with patience the race that is set before him,—he will in prosperity be grateful to the bountiful hand of his Maker, and in adversity be reconciled and submissive to his fate. The Christian Universalist, were he the tenant of a wretched prison, would be more happy than the unbeliever, though he were seated on a throne, and crowned with a diadem. For he knows, that he will shortly be released, and conducted by guardian angels to the enjoyment of the inheritance which Christ has prepared for him, "where are fulness of joys, and rivers of pleasure for evermore." He that believes the "Record that God hath given of his Son," will rest free from alarm, though the lightning's flash, and thunder's roar should shake the solid ground. Should poverty clothe him with tattered garments, and disease waste his flesh, yet he will rejoice, knowing that he is clothed with the righteousness of his Redeemer as with a garment,—and though pain and disease may cause his flesh to return to its mother earth, he knows that Christ hath prepared for him a mansion, a "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The opposers of the Universalian religion, have frequently observed, that "it would do very well to live by, but that it would not answer in the hour of death." Permit me to ask, what greater consolation any person could have in the hour of his dissolution, than the perfect assurance, that he was merely changing the mode of his existence, that he was on the verge of entering into the enjoyment of greater blessedness, than he could possibly conceive; that he was about to join the Angelic Host, and the spirits of just men made perfect,—that he would shortly behold his Saviour God with unclouded eyes, join the heavenly choir, and chant the praises of his Redeemer, through the boundless ages of eternity. Methinks that such assurance, that such religion, would enable him to exclaim with his expiring breath, "O death, where is thy sting! O Grave, where is thy victory!" When the last trumpet sounds, and the declaration is made that time shall be no longer, when the heavens roll together like a scroll, and the elements melt with fervent heat; when convulsions rock the world, and the sun is clothed in darkness, and the moon turned into blood,—when the stars fall from their orbs, and time shall be buried with the world in undistinguished ruin; then, having the sheet-anchor of his hope cast in heaven, he will remain tranquil and undisturbed, knowing that the "Lord is his shield and buckler, and his sure defence." He will, therefore, rejoice, with joy unspeakable and full of glory, saying, "Come Lord Jesus, come quickly." True religion admits of neither doubts or fears; but is an anchor to the soul, both sure and steadfast. It gives even here an antepast of heaven; it gives us the perfect assurance, that all the nations and families of the earth will ultimately arrive in the heavenly clime, where they shall flourish in eternal bloom.

HALCYON.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

The Baltimore Baptist Association, at their last session, resolved to shut their pulpits against all clergymen, who preach the doctrine of a general atonement.

Conversion.—A clergyman of the Methodist connexion, in the town of Frankfort, State of Maine, has recently been translated from the kingdom of darkness, into the kingdom of Jesus Christ; and from the power of Satan, to the knowledge of the true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. "Shout ye lower parts of the earth, for the Lord hath done it."

"O Sing unto the Lord a new Song; for he hath done marvellous things: his right hand, and his holy arm, hath gotten him the victory. The Lord hath made known his salvation: his righteousness hath he openly shewed in the sight of the heathen. He hath remembered his truth toward the house of Israel: all the ends of the earth hath seen the salvation of our God." This is the prophecy and declaration of the Holy Spirit. Hath he said, and shall it not be done?

REVIEW OF THE REV. MR. M'CLELLAND'S SERMON.

(*Continued from page 52.*)

The Rev. Author, in his 10th page, describes the Missionary Society, as seized with a "*noble frenzy*," occasioned by "the *fervour* of their *benevolence*," and that they "ACTUALLY *cherish* the *idea*,—that the period is not far distant, when this terrible ACELDAMA, this *shocking* theatre of tragedy and crime, shall be *restored* to the *favour* of its Celestial Proprietor, and become, what it was EVER DESIGNED TO BE, *a Paradise of God!*" We acknowledge, with the greatest pleasure, that this is indeed noble; this is worthy of the Creator, and consoling to the creature; and we think it a great pity, that this "*noble frenzy*" is not more general, especially, so far as relates to the *fact*, that "*man was ever designed* to be *a Paradise* of God." We presume it cannot be the inanimate *stones* and *dirt*, which compose the earth, that our Rev. Author means, but *man*, the creature and offspring of God, &c. Speaking of the sentiments of those, who are *not seized* "with this noble frenzy," our Rev. Author says, "It tells you, in short, "Go, weep over a cursed world, doomed to perpetual desolation." And adds, "It is scarcely *possible* that the *milk* of *human kindness* can flow in a *breast* that has given it admission. *Even if* a TRUTH, *it is one*, which *Almighty God does not require us to* BELIEVE, and which no *man*, endowed *with the* LEAST TENDERNESS OF FEELING *can for a moment* think of WITHOUT HORROR!!! and, at the same time, a *strenuous* endeavour to *practise a delusion* upon his *understanding* in *respect* to *it!*" This is truth.—and we ask our Rev. Author,—where was the *milk* of *human kindness* in *your* breast? And where were your *tender feelings*, when you declared in your 14th page, that "the salvation of EIGHT HUNDRED MILLIONS of *your brethren* was AT STAKE?" And in your 35th page, that "They are *living* without hope, and day by day, *peopling* the *receptacle* of the LOST?" Where, then, was your "*noble frenzy?*" Had not you the *least tenderness of feeling?* Did you *strenuously* endeavour to *practise a delusion* upon *your* understanding? Or, *had the milk of human kindness ceased to flow in your breast?* Words have no meaning, if this inconsistent and abominable rhapsody, is not accusing Jehovah of a cruelty and barbarity of the blackest die! It is blasphemy of the deepest hue, to call upon men, See 34th page, "to think of the *thousand millions* of *souls* PERISHING," and to declare, as this Rev. Author has done in his 10th page, that "No man, endowed with the least tenderness of feeling, can for a moment think of it without HORROR!" What! accuse that God, who gave his blood to ransom man,—that God whose name and nature is Love,—accuse him of purposes and conduct, which even *guilty man*, if he has the *least tenderness*, cannot *think of* without HORROR! If that God, who is thus infamously traduced and defamed, possessed one-thousandth part of the cruelty, which this *accursed* and impious slander has imputed to him,—he would, ere this, have blasted with his fiercest vengeance, the audacious wretch, who so impiously presumed to arraign him. Yes,—this infernal slander would not have escaped the door of his lips, *ere he was livid* with the lightning of offended heaven! This, if no other evidence could be adduced in proof of the *mercy* of God, is more than sufficient,—it is irresistible!

Our Rev. Author, in his 13th page, asks, "whether it be not the *little* word, *all*, which contains the *whole* element of *excitement*. For *my own* part," adds the Rev. Author, "On analyzing MY FEELINGS, I think, I DISTINCTLY PERCEIVE, that the *very suggestion* of a *doubt*, whether to the God of Salvation, "Every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear," at *once chills my ardour* and almost *extinguishes* the *desire* of attempting *any thing* in behalf of the *miserable* heathen." Reader,—Did you ever before hear such language from a *disciple* of Calvin? Is not this a *phenomenon* in the religious world? Whoever expected to hear of a professed Calvinist, voluntarily *analyzing his feelings*, and with all the *precision* of a skilful Anatomist informing the public of the *result* of the *dissection*,—the *discovery* he had made? It is, indeed, an *astonishing* occurrence,—it is a *wonderful* discovery! We here see a Calvinist, whose *faith* in the *eternal misery* of a large proportion of the "family of man" is as strongly fixed, or at least *pretended* so to be, as it is in the *belief* of the *salvation* of the *few* remaining *elect*,—we see him *analyzing* his feelings, and hear, with wonder and astonishment, a declaration which amounts to a full, complete, and *plump* denial of his principles,—*namely*, If the doctrine of John Calvin, which I am in the practice of preaching, is *true*, and all mankind will not be saved, it "at *once chills* MY ARDOUR, and almost extinguishes the desire of attempting any thing in behalf of the miserable heathen!" This is, in truth and verity, an honest confession, and we recommend it to the serious attention of all the disciples of Calvin, far and near; and further, we believe this their brother in their faith, has, though unwittingly, to use a common, but *very significant expression*, "Let the *cat* out of the bag!" And we believe now, that the *secret*, "the *cat*," is out, it will keep out! It is our opinion, that the declaration, that "The *wise* are taken in *their* own craftiness," is very applicable in this place; and we cannot help anticipating a little, and *wondering*, what the Rev. Author, and his coadjutors will have to say in defence of this, which, if not a *plump denial*, is a *terrible satire* upon their Calvinistic creed! Will they pretend, that their *faith*, and their *feelings*, are *two* things? That they differ, if so, we only apply the rule, which they, through the medium of our Rev. Author, have introduced, in his 10th page, to the public, and which he says, "Condemns you with hopeless despair; with ruthless hand it tears down the *only refuge* to *which*, sickened with the sight and tales of wo, you can fly for comfort and relief. It tells you, in short, *go*, *weep* over a cursed world, doomed to perpetual desolation." And adds, "The advocates of this *withering hypothesis* may glory as they please in their wondrous discernment, their calm philosophy, their freedom from the trammels of prejudice. But *dearly* do they purchase their triumph. It is scarcely possible that the milk of human kindness can flow in a breast, that has given it admission!" And adds, wonderful to relate, it is that "which no man, endowed with the *least* tenderness of *feeling*, can for *a moment* think of *without* HORROR!" Now answer,—does your faith bear the test of this analysis? NO! And if these premises are correct, and they are *your own*, the faith, or doctrine of Calvinism, is abominable beyond description! Our Rev. Author has certainly established his reputation for *eccentricity* of conception, and *boldness* of expression, if nothing else. And we shrewdly suspect, that if his dogmatical prototype, John Calvin, had heard him make the declarations, which are found in his 12th and 14th pages, *videlicit*, "We *admire* the *very falsehoods* of a people, awaking to a sense of their degradation, and the GLORY OF GOD, and the salvation of eight hundred millions of our brethren ARE AT STAKE!" that he would have either *praised*, or *blamed* him in very expressive terms! Whether it is *praising*, or *blaspheming* God, to declare that "His *glory* is at *stake*," and by inference, optional with the New-York Missionary Society to *save* it from being *lost*, and God being left *destitute* of his *good reputation*; we leave to the good sense of the public to determine! It is, however, our opinion, that if *we were to declare*, that our Rev. Author's *reputation was at stake*, he would take it rather unkindly. But this much we do say, that if he preaches any more Missionary Sermons, of the complexion with the one under consideration, his reputation as a Calvinist will suffer.

Our Rev. Author, in his 17th page, speaking of the blessings which have resulted from Missionary efforts, says, "They have made the sordid wretch, whose thoughts never rose above the little provision to be made for the daily wants of wife and family, a *sublime contemplative philosopher*; who in schemes for the happiness of his fellows, in pleasing conjectures as to the good his hard-earned contributions to the *treasury* of the *Lord* will be *found productive* at the *great day*." &c. Add to this, the declaration, See 20th page, "that every dollar and every cent would go *far* to *save* some poor *soul* from *death*!" Is it possible, that a man, who is dignified with the appellation of Reverend, and Master of Arts, and who professes to make the Scriptures his constant study, and to preach nothing inconsistent with them, that he should preach and publish such blasphemous *stuff* as the above-mentioned declarations must appear to be, if the Scriptures are of any validity? God reproving the Israelites for their sins, by his prophet Isaiah, 48th chap. 5th verse, says, "I have even from the beginning declared to thee; before it came to pass I shewed thee; lest thou shouldest say, Mine idol hath done them," &c. And at the 9th verse, "For *My name's-sake*, will I defer mine anger, and for *my praise* will I refrain for thee, that I cut thee not off. Behold I have *refined* thee, but *not with silver*; I have chosen thee in the *furnace* of *affliction*. For *mine own sake*, *even* for my own sake will I do it: for how should *my name be polluted*? And I *will not* give *my glory* unto *another*." Reader, recollect our Rev. Author's declaration, that "the glory of God is at stake." Does not the declaration of God, "For my own sake, will I do it: for how should my name be polluted?" does it not speak in the plainest and strongest language a useful lesson to the New-York Missionary Society?" And does not God tell them, that his glory does not depend on them? And that he will *refine and save*, but *not* with *silver*, but for his name's sake, and for his praise? And is it not inferred; nay more, declared, that if he *did not refine*, &c. his name would be polluted? Read, in addition to this, the declaration of the apostle Peter, in his 1st Epistle, 1st chap. 18th and 19th verses, "Forasmuch, as ye know, that ye were not REDEEMED with *corruptible* things, as SILVER and GOLD, &c. but WITH THE PRECIOUS BLOOD OF CHRIST, as of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot." We ask, these *would be saviours*, who have not waited for "the stranger to praise them," but have "declared within the gates," even in the gates of the Lord's house, that their "motives are above all praise;" that they are going to "*emancipate*, or *save* the family of man, from the thraldom of ignorance and sin," that "every dollar and cent will go far to save some poor soul from death," that "the world is under the pressure of a fatal curse for six thousand years," that "the glory of God is at stake," that "the salvation of eight hundred millions of souls is at stake," that "a thousand million of souls are perishing," that "they are living without enjoyment, dying without hope, and day by day peopling the receptacle of the lost;" and ask, "Is there a heart in this assembly that does not throb at the agonizing reflection, and would not give a thousand worlds to escape from the conviction that it is the sober truth?" On the authority of the God of the whole earth, who has declared, "That all nations whom he has made shall come and worship before him," that "all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto God, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him," that "He is the Saviour of all men, and has MADE PEACE by the *blood* of *his* cross, BY HIM to reconcile all unto himself, whether in heaven, or on earth," and hath "SWORN by himself, that all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth should be blessed in Christ," that "God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," and that "every knee shall bow, and every tongue swear, that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength," that "every tongue shall confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father," that "the last enemy shall be destroyed; DEATH!" that, "the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and he will be their God;" and that "God will wipe off tears from all faces, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away," on the authority of this Great, One only living and true God, we declare, that the declarations of the New-York Missionary Society, made public through their speaker, and published to the world in this sermon, are FALSE and BLASPHEMOUS, and we [illegible]

them, that they ought to be ashamed of themselves! *(To be continued.)*

CONTROVERSIAL.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald,

SIR,—In your 13th number, you say, in answer to my first communication, "If we had no other knowledge, or revelation of God, than is contained in the 10th verse, we should not have one word to reply to our correspondent's accusation." Thus far, all is well. If the grammatical construction of the sentence, in the original, will not admit of a change in our common translation, I can see no necessity, or even propriety, in attempting to prove that any other meaning would be more consistent with the general tenure of the Scriptures.

If as you declare in your answer, "every man who denies the testimony, or witness of God, does, in fact, give him the lie direct," why not attach this meaning to the text in controversy, which is perfectly consistent with the original and every translation I have seen except your's? I have always supposed that John meant, "he who believeth not God," by his unbelief, giveth God the lie.

The subsequent part of your answer appears to have but very little bearing on the case; as I have never attempted to prove, and never supposed that any part of Scripture tended to prove God a liar, I regretted the introduction of so many witnesses in this case, as the benefit derived from their testimony seems to fall short of the expense of summoning them. If you saw the following quotation, "The man who robs Jack, exposes himself to the law." Would you presume to say, the comma, which now stands after the word "*Jack*," might be moved, and placed before *it?* thereby conveying the idea, that Jack exposes himself to the law by being robbed? No, Sir, you would not. The nature of the sentence imperiously forbids it. This case is *similar* to the *other*, if *compared* with the *original*, with this *difference* only, that Theo, or God, in the Greek, has the stamp of the dative, which shows its connexion with the verb that precedes it, and bars it from all connexion with the verb that follows it; whereas the word "*Jack*," has nothing in its termination to denote its case. But this difference is in my favour.

I cannot exactly agree with you in the case of perjury you were pleased to propose; you remark, "the witness of three men will convict a man of perjury; and it is said they made the man a liar. But, if four witnesses of equal veracity testified in favour of the man's integrity, he could not be made, or proved to be a liar." As the evidence of the first three witnesses would be positive, and that of the latter negative, the man would, in my opinion, be pronounced guilty. If three respectable witnesses should testify that they saw you pick my pocket, and twenty others should testify as to your conceived, good moral character, you would be convicted, all your logic and law to the contrary, notwithstanding.

As you were pleased to thank me for my "reproof," I, in like-manner, thank you, for your answer, and be assured, Sir, that the smallest notice will always excite in me the most lively sense of gratitude.

VERITATIS AMICUS.

ANSWER.

As the matter in dispute is assuming a shape and bearing, different from that, which we conceive properly belongs to this paper, (it being our opinion, that an error in sentiment is of much greater moment, than a supposed error in what may be termed *grammatical construction*,) we decline answering our correspondent any further, than simply to state, that, if we have *told* the *truth*, *well*,—if *not*,—we shall *acknowledge* our *errors* as soon as we can *find* them.

Note. The shifting the *comma*, from the word *Jack*, to the word *robs*, instead of *altering* the *arrangement* of the *sentence*, would *sever* it, and make *two* sentences; which would have no more connexion *one* with the *other*, than there is between the *first*, and *last* letter in the alphabet. We, however, believe it to be our duty to acknowledge, that in our opinion the motive of our correspondent may be not only justifiable, but praiseworthy; and when it is considered, that the *countenances* of men do not *differ*, more than their *views* and opinions, we are more disposed to rejoice at the *similarity*, than to *quarrel* on account of any *difference* of opinion which exists at present between VERITATIS AMICUS and the EDITOR.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—To mutilate, misrepresent and prejudge, has been the practice of professors of religion in all ages; but the disciples of the meek and lowly Jesus ought not to aid the accuser of the brethren; the world is glad to slander God's people, and too often these join the confederacy. Instead of taking indifferent characters and saying to them, "Stand by yourselves, for I am holier than thou," my object was to unite the whole congregation to the irradiation of the Sun of Righteousness, as your own words serve to prove. However, Christians are best qualified to conduct the ordinances of Christ. I am very happy to see your definition of the *evil* tree, and the *good* one. Certainly the first, and the second Adam, are intended. And did mankind view the Scriptures in this correct sense, they could not fabricate the many mistaken notions of the ever blessed God, which are constantly exhibited. "Cease then," ye modern Pharisees, "from Adam, whose breath was in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of." May the words of Jesus to the ancient whited sepulchres be applicable to you. To them he said, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." Though divine revelation be not a formal system, it has more harmony than all human systems, for every word of God is pure, and it is the only system that must all be fulfilled. I have often admired the 18th verse of the 1st chap. of the apostle James. "Of his own will, begat he us by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures." This, to me, appears to be an epitome of the whole will of God. The persons spoken of, I apprehend are all that believe in the Messiah, from the beginning of time, to the last moment of this dispensation. God has chosen them to bear his name, and he is not ashamed to be called their God, because though dead in sins and trespasses, he quickens or begets them by his Spirit, to a new spiritual life, whereby like new-born babes they desire the sincere milk of the word; this is effected by the word of truth, or, as it is expressed in the epistle to the Ephesians, 1st chap. 14th verse, the gospel of salvation. The good news of redemption in Christ, for the very chief of sinners, is the grand mean by which they are made to rejoice in the hope of the glory of God; so that now is the accepted time, and now is the day of salvation, as witnessed by the prophets and apostles. Of them alone it is said, that they shall live and reign with Christ a thousand years, for they are the saints of the Most High, and they shall inherit the earth. Then will God make up his jewels, and Jesus will stand and say to his Father, Here am I, and the children thou hast given me; this is that reward to which Moses had respect, and is frequently mentioned in God's word as the glory ready to be revealed. But James says, that the design of God, in thus saving a part of mankind, was, that they might be a kind of *first* fruits of his creatures. This consideration compelled John to write, "Jesus the Righteous is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." With his own blood, he purchased the church,—his bride, the Lamb's wife,—but at the same time he tasted death for all, God only excepted. This was his own declaration to the people, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all unto me." When he bear our iniquities in his own body on the tree, till all that was written concerning him was fulfilled, then he said, "It is finished, and gave up the Ghost." His tomb was designed with the rich, and with the wicked his death, for he was numbered with transgressors, and bear the sin of the multitude, of which God gave assurance unto all, in raising him from the dead. And having by himself purged our sins according to God's declaration, when he proclaimed his name, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, destroying iniquity, transgression and sin, though in clearing the guilty, he will not clear the Surety; he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. And this he did not so much as an Intercessor, but as a mighty conquerer he must reign until he subdues all things to himself. Indeed previous to this antitypical jubilee, he will take his great power and reign with the saints in the kingdom of their Father, in his glory, and in the glory of his holy angels, which shall be that age of life, when the wise Virgins shall go into the marriage supper of the Lamb, but the foolish shall be shut out in outer darkness, until they suffer a while in correction, whereof all are partakers. Not that God willingly afflicts any, but it is for their profit, and that they may be partakers of his holiness. His face will be against them that do evil, to cut off their remembrance from the earth, but they will cry, and the Lord will hear and deliver them out of all their troubles O! then, that men would praise Jehovah for his goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of Adam. That this may be our employ daily, is the hearty prayer of,

Sir, Yours, &c.

J. C.

EXTRACT *from the "Evangelical Guardian and Review."*

"In no *one* legitimate sense of the words *atonement* or *atone*, can the doctrine that Christ atoned or made atonement for the non-elect as well as for the elect, be true, *unless* that of Universal salvation be also true, a THING!!! which the advocates of *general* atonement SHUDDER at *admitting*, as well as their opponents; but which is *infallibly* TRUE, if the philological and scriptural idea of *atonement*, *atoning*, *propitiation* and *expiation* be connected with their position, that Christ *atoned* or made *atonement* for *every* man."

Reader, this is a specimen of Calvinism. The word *philological*, as used here, is synonymous with *humane*;—thus, if the "*humane* and scriptural idea of atonement, &c. be connected, &c. that THING!!! which makes them SHUDDER! is TRUE!!! Reader,—the "*positions*" of men are not worth talking about. Hear the "position" of Jehovah! "I have given him, Christ, for a light, a covenant to the Gentiles, and he SHALL be MY SALVATION to the ENDS of the *earth!* ALL *nations* whom God *has made* SHALL COME, and *worship* before him; all the *ends* of the *world* SHALL *remember* and *turn* unto God." Again, "God is in Christ *reconciling* the WORLD," not the *few elect*, "unto himself!" It is preposterously blasphemous for these PHARISEES thus to calumniate the *Saviour* of the *world*,—thus to slander the KING of heaven.

To Correspondents.

A communication signed Miletum, is received; in which, the writer directs our attention to several passages in the New Testament, as containing conditions, &c. We request him to *look again* at our *answer* to Philotheus. We think he has mistaken the matter altogether; we are ready to meet him, or any other man, or all men, only let him, or they, comply with our *reasonable* condition; for if salvation is *conditional*, a greater absurdity cannot be conceived, than the *bare* supposition, that those *conditions* are so obscure and undefined, that not *one* of all *those* who must *perform* them can *tell* what *they are!* Although we do not consider ourselves under any obligation to notice this *half way* epistle, still with a view to prevent *misconstruction*, we shall publish it in our next number.

An Inquirer after Truth, is unavoidably postponed until next week.

All Communications forwarded to the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter-box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 12, 1820. NO. 17.

The purposes of God are revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(*Continued from page 49.*)

The word elect, is next made use of by Mark, 13th chap. 20th, 22d, 27th verses, in giving an account of the prophecies of Christ, relative to the destruction of Jerusalem; and is the same as that recorded by Matthew, 24th chap. which we have already examined.

The word elect is next found in Luke, 18th chap. 17th verse. This chapter commences with the parable of the "importunate widow, and the unjust judge," &c. Christ, who relates this parable, in allusion to the judge, who yielded to the importunity of the widow, asks, "And shall not God avenge his own *elect*, which cry day and night unto him? Though he bear long with them, I tell you, that he will avenge them speedily." We consider the *elect here* spoken of, to have a particular allusion to the "prophets and righteous *men*," whom Christ said, desired to see his day, &c. These, unquestionably, were Israelites, who were designed by God, when speaking of Cyrus as anointed, &c. He said, "For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect." It was these elect Israelites, who, under the Mosaic dispensation, were instructed by God to look for Christ, to whom all the sacrifices during that dispensation pointed, and of whom they were types. The "*avenging*" which Christ spoke of, is the same with that spoken of by the prophet, in the 63d chap. of Isaiah, 4th verse, "For the day of vengeance *is* in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come." This passage points direct to the crucifixion of Christ. It is remarkable, that the *vengeance* of the Lord, is spoken of as a *day*, and not as a *million* of ages, or *eternity;* and when the word *redeemed* is spoken of in this verse, it is coupled with the word *year*. And it is a glorious consideration, that the redeemed of the Lord are those, who are purchased with the blood of Christ, and whose transgressions, or iniquities were laid on him, and who are *all men;*—for the "blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin; and Jesus by the grace of God, tasted death for *every man!*" We now see the truth of our Saviour's declaration, "I tell you he will avenge them speedily." It was but a very short time after making this declaration, that Christ "avenged his elect," by offering himself as a Lamb, without blemish, on Calvary, for a then lost but now redeemed world! How different is the *vengeance* here spoken of, from the vengeance of *guilty man*. Christ commanded men to pray for their enemies; and he, their glorious Head, set them an example by laying down his life for his enemies, and procuring salvation and heaven for those, by whose hands he was slain. Therefore, let no man consider himself as the elect of God, unless even the vengeance of his heart is a disposition to bless his enemies, and do good to those who are his bitterest persecutors and foes! The common understanding of this passage, is such as might be expected from a self-righteous Pharisee; who, exalted in his own estimation, would be gratified to be received into heaven as elect, holy and precious; and see destruction and misery visited upon the heads of those, who in his opinion were unworthy and undeserving. The parable of the two men, the Pharisee and Publican, who went up into the temple to pray, and which immediately follows the account of the unjust judge, &c. and the declaration of Christ, that God would avenge *his own elect!* &c. is explanatory of the doctrine which Christ intended to establish, and the instruction he conveyed in this chapter. The two characters, or motives to action, which are exhibited in the persons and conduct of the Pharisee and Publican, are descriptive of, and applicable to all mankind. We feel justified in declaring,—that from the creation to the present moment, there has not existed a man, who would not come under one of these descriptions. We think the phraseology of this chapter very remarkable. It "is God's *own* elect," whom God will avenge. It is not the *Pharisee*, who boasts of his *personal holiness*, and by *inference* thanks God that he is *not* as *other men are;* as the *non-elect*. We repeat it, it is God's elect. It is not *those*, who, in *their own estimation* are the *elect* of God! It is not the self-righteous Pharisee,—but the humble Publican! Reader,—who in our day resemble these two characters? Who are they who are in the habit of *thanking God, that they are not as other men are*, extortioners,—unjust,—adulterers,—or even as this Publican? Who are they, who are making invidious comparisons? praising themselves, and exalting their motives to the very heavens? Who are they, who claim the exclusive character of children of God? who hang their heads at times like bulrushes, and for a pretence make long prayers? They are those, who seek the applause of men! They are those, whose "place shall be appointed among hypocrites; and who shall receive the greater DAMNATION!"

The word *elect*, next occurs in the epistle of Paul to the Romans, 8th chap. 33d verse. It is not possible for language to be more conclusive, and at the same time opposed to the modern Calvinistic and Hopkinsian doctrines of election, than that which is contained in this chap. particularly from the 28th verse to the end of the chapter. That those who are in this life believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, and his salvation, are designated in the Scriptures as *elected*, we acknowledge with the most heart felt pleasure and satisfaction; but, that all the remainder of the human race who are not thus designated, are to be reprobate, and endlessly miserable, the Scriptures, so far from authorizing an idea of this kind, are full of positive declarations to the contrary. It is astonishing, that the disciples of Calvin have been so blind to the plain tenor of Scripture, as to remain ignorant to this day, that, whenever, and wherever, the Scriptures speak of the *blood* of the *covenant*, of the *atonement* for sin by Jesus Christ, or of *salvation* by his *cross*, that the WORLD,—EVERY MAN,—ALL MEN,—are spoken of. And where the *elect* are spoken of, in *contradistinction* to the rest of mankind, they are *only* regarded as being "*conformed* to the *image* of the Son of God, that they may be the *first born* among MANY brethren." They are, to use the language of James, "A kind of first fruits unto God of his creatures."

The pitiful shifts, to which the disciples of Calvin are reduced, in their *puerile* attempts to maintain their doctrine, would, were the subject of a *less* serious nature, afford much diversion, and as it is, we believe they may challenge comparison for inconsistency and folly. Do they want to prove *their* doctrine of *election*, they quote the declaration of Christ, "*Many* are *called*,—but *few* are *chosen*." And to illustrate, and prove the *smallness* of the *number* who are *elected* and *chosen*, they *lay* a wonderful distress on the word *few*,—but, are they required to explain how their elect are *saved*, they are obliged to quote Paul's declaration, in his 8th chap. to the Romans. "Moreover, whom he did *predestinate*, them (who?) "he also CALLED! and WHOM he *called*" (who were these, Mr. Calvin? Not the *elect few* whom *you say* are the *chosen*,—it must be the *many called* according to your view of the subject, whom Paul declares) "he *also* JUSTIFIED!" Paul goes on to say, "What shall *we* then *say* to these things? If God *be for us*, who *can* be against us?" Now, mark what Paul says, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up *for us* ALL!" *not* for *us few*, "how shall he not with him freely give *us all* things." Paul then asks the question,—"Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? *It is* God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?" Paul asks, and we answer,—John Calvin, and his disciples; and Dr. Hopkins and his disciples, and many others whom we might name, and conclude with the addition of the DEVIL, the accuser of the brethren! Paul again interrogates, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" The reader will please to notice, that the *us*, here spoken of, are the *many called*, not the *few chosen*,—and readers who are Calvinists, are informed, that their *chosen few*, includes JUDAS ISCARIOT, and let them do their best, *they cannot* get *rid of him;* for we have Christ's own declaration to prove the fact,—*videlicet*, "Have not I CHOSEN *you* twelve!" Will not ALL the *chosen* few be *saved?* Reader, there is no remedy here,—you must *keep Judas*, or *lose* the WHOLE!!! Did not Christ add, "And one of you is a devil?" Did Christ mean Judas? Was Judas a devil? and if so, do not Calvinists advocate the salvation of a devil? Or should it be rendered, "one of you hath a devil?" Christ told his disciples another time, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." Christ then included Judas. Again,—Christ told them, the twelve, with Judas among them, "Ye

shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Therefore, is it not certain, that the foundation of Calvinism supports *Judas*, and saves Judas, as much as it supports, or saves any man? And if the *doctrine* or *decree* of *election* is the *name*, whereby *they* expect to be *saved*, is it *not* a *different* name from the name of *Jesus*, which the Scriptures declare, "Is the *only name* under heaven *given* among *men*, whereby they *can* be saved? Paul asks, "Who shall separate us from the love of God?" And answers,—"For *I am persuaded*, that neither DEATH nor *life*, nor *principalities*, nor *powers*; nor things *present*, nor *things* to *come*, &c. nor any other creature," &c. We have seen that Paul does not mean, by *called*, the *few* that are *chosen*; he therefore does not mean, by *us*, those exclusively, whom the Calvinists consider to be the *elect*, and *chosen few*. Who shall we believe? Our modern disciples of Calvin, who declare, that *death* separates us for ever from the love of God, or Paul, who declares, that nothing that can be named, "can separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord?"

Quere. Can the devil separate us from the love of God? Or is not the devil included in the declaration, "Nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers?"

(To be Continued.)

CONTROVERSIAL.

COMMUNICATION.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald

DEAR SIR,—The writer of the following remarks, is a sincere inquirer after truth, and wishes that it may be established on whatever side it may be found. And although he rejects with you, Sir, the doctrine of endless misery, he does not see evidence sufficiently clear, to believe in the Divinity of Christ; or Divine revelation so called.

The councils of Nice and Laodicea were held about 350 years after the time Christ is said to have lived, and the books that now compose the New Testament, were then voted for by yeas and nays, as we now vote a law; a great many that were offered, were rejected by a majority of nays. I believe, forty gospels were offered, and only four admitted as genuine; and even one of these, St. Luke's gospel, at one council, was rejected as spurious, but received as genuine at a subsequent council; just in the same way the Parliament of England bastardized, and then legitimated Queen Elizabeth. As the men who composed these councils were fallible, and some of them weak, and even wicked men, the writer of these remarks cannot swallow down as the word of God, their decisions. The Old Testament tells us, that God created the heavens and the earth, and every thing therein, in six days. Now, as the eternal salvation of men is of much greater importance than this creation, and as that salvation depends, as the New Testament tell us, on man's knowledge of, and belief in Jesus Christ, it necessarily follows, from our belief in the goodness and justice of God, and our knowledge of his Almighty power and wisdom, as demonstrated in the creation, that all this, if true, would be made known to all parts of the world in as little time, at least, as was employed in making the world. To suppose the Almighty would pay greater regard and attention to the creation and organization of inanimate matter, than he would to the salvation of innumerable millions of souls, which himself had created, "As the image of himself," is to offer an insult to his goodness and his justice. Now observe, how the promulgation of this salvation, by a knowledge of, and a belief in Jesus Christ, went on, compared with the work of creation.

In the first place, it took longer to make the child, than to make the world; for nine months were passed away and totally lost in a state of pregnancy, which is more than forty times longer than God employed in making the world, according to the Bible account. *Secondly*,—Several years of Christ's life was lost in a state of human infancy; but the universe was in maturity the moment it existed. *Thirdly*,—Christ, as Luke asserts, was thirty years old before he began his mission; millions of souls died in the mean time, without knowing it. *Fourthly*,—It was about three hundred years from that time, before the book called the New Testament, was compiled into a written copy before which time there was no such book. *Fifthly*,—It was about a thousand years after that, before it could be circulated; because neither Jesus, nor his apostles, had knowledge of, or were inspired with the art of printing; and consequently, as the means for making it universally known did not exist, the means were not equal to the end; and, therefore, it is not the work of God.

If you can, dear Sir, through the medium of your useful paper, obviate these doubts, you will confer a favour on a *sincere*

INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

REMARKS.

We consider our correspondent, according to his own account of himself, as being in a state of vacuity; having rejected error, he is now bewildered in a maze of skepticism; and all his *faith* consists in *believing that* what *others believe is false*. It has been acknowledged by numbers, who have *escaped* from the dreary wilds of infidelity, that the state of their minds, while unbelievers, was unstable, uncomfortable, dark and cheerless. And this *one fact*, independent of all other evidence, is sufficient to prove, that, let who will be *right*, they are *wrong*. The most intelligent deistical writers have contended, that Revelation was unnecessary, not from the fact that a knowledge of the Creator was not useful to his creatures, but on the principle that he had revealed himself sufficiently plain in his works, and consequently, every other revelation being unnecessary, there could not of course be another. Now we consider this argument, if such it be called, to militate against themselves; for it is a notorious fact, that Deists are alone found in those countries where the Scriptures are known. And it is well worthy of remark, that contrasting the writing of modern Deists, with those of the ancient *Theists*, the difference in favour of our modern infidels is found to originate from the very Scriptures and revelations, which they contemn, as unnecessary and useless. We have no hesitation in declaring, that a Deist, professing sentiments of the kind of modern infidels, never was heard of, until the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were revealed to, and distributed among mankind. Where are the moderns, who will pretend, that any, the most illustrious for their talents, during the last, or the present century, were wiser than those celebrated sages of antiquity, who stood unrivalled in their own ages and countries? Where did our modern sages obtain their knowledge of God and his purposes, a knowledge, as far superior to that of the ancients, as revelation and certainty is superior to paganism and doubt? *Ans.* They obtained it from the Scriptures; from those very Scriptures which they pretend are a silly tale and fable. The celebrated Paine, who stood at the head of the infidels of our own age and country, was obliged, when he wrote his "Common Sense," to have recourse to the Scriptures to find the origin of kings; and by this one act, did more to establish their genuineness and authenticity, ten times told, than his *puerile* Age of Reason afterwards did to *decry* them. And what advantages could Paine be supposed to possess, and what could enable him to judge impartially, when we have his own testimony, that when he commenced the writing of his "Age of Reason," he had not looked inside of a Bible for two years; and did not even keep one in his house. What could be expected from such a commentator, whose prejudices arose even to antipathy, and denied himself the privilege of *reading* the *book* he was trying to condemn? Were the Scriptures based on no better evidence than the objections which are brought against them by these unbelievers, they would long, ere this day, have sunk into oblivion. We presume no one will be disposed to controvert our declaration, that Deistical writers have invariably been prejudiced against the Bible to that degree, that they either avoided it altogether, or if they took it in their hands, it was for no other motive, but to *pull* it to *pieces!* If our premises are correct, relative to Deists being alone found in Christian countries, and we presume to say they cannot be controverted, it is evident, that the *cause* must be found where the *effect* is found. No man will pretend to say, that an *effect* is not preceded by a cause. This would be too absurd to merit even a simple denial. And when it is likewise considered, that Deists, of the stamp of those in our times, are a *genus* altogether unknown before the days of the apostles and the promulgation of the Scriptures, it must amount to a certainty, that the cause must be cotemporary with the effect, and be traced to the times when the effect was produced. Here is a weapon, to which the shield of Deism can never be opposed with success. And this weapon is a stubborn *fact*, which they well know is interwoven and identified with the very existence of infidelity itself. This *book*, which they so much deride, contains one simple truth, which, to a mind free from prejudice, is an unanswerable argument in favour of its truth, even if weighed in the balance of deistical and scrutinizing examination, *namely*, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." This is a truth, which Deists take the liberty to deny with their mouths, but by a necessity of consistency beyond their control, they compensate for their infidelity of principle, by *testifying* to the *truth* of the declaration of the *Scriptures* by *their conduct* and actions! And on the other hand, they give the lie to their declaration, that *nature* teaches them all that is good, by practising the reverse; and proving, either, that their *doctrine* is *false*, or, that they do not *believe* it themselves!

The shape in which our correspondent has brought forward his objections to the Scrip-

tures of the Old and New Testaments, and the divinity of Christ, &c. is very objectionable, especially if he considered them to contain any thing which has the least resemblance to argument or reason; and it is in our opinion very essential for every person to know, at *least*, that there is a great difference between *objecting* to, or *denying a thing* or *principle, and proving it false.* We think that Deists, of *all* men, ought to bear this in mind; for, however much it may hurt their *vanity*, it can never injure their *real* characters, to be acquainted with their *obstinacy* and *ignorance.* Every man who *pretends* to know the difference between day and night, summer and winter, and to count to the number of ten, and professes himself satisfied with the convictions of his own understanding and judgment, and who shall make use of his mental faculties, and declare his conviction of the existence of any thing or principle, from evidence collateral in its nature, and believe the existence of any thing out of the sight of his own eyes, and then turn about and deny that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are a revelation from God, and declare, that they are fictitious and false, and that Jesus Christ and all his apostles and disciples were lying impostors, IS A FOOL! The moment a man has professed to believe any thing, and to declare his conviction of its truth or existence from the evidence of two witnesses, he has committed himself; and whenever he refuses his assent to the truth, or existence of any possible thing, when more than ten witnesses testify to the truth of it, he either gives the *lie* to his former faith, or proves himself to be out of his wits and insane! We believe this will stand the test; it is a plain simple rule, obvious to the capacity of every reasonable man, and therefore of universal application and utility. We now ask, was there ever a Deist who refused his assent to the truth of the declaration, that the City of Troy once existed, and was destroyed by the Greeks? It is presumed, that almost every Deist will acknowledge this to be truth. We ask them for their proof? And wonderful to relate, Homer is that one solitary evidence, or witness,—a man, who has been dead nearly three thousand years; but it is so *reasonable*, that Deists believe it.* The *story* is told in the Iliad; and the Bible is so very *inconsistent* and *unreasonable*, and the Iliad is so very *consistent* and *reasonable*, that it forces conviction! The Bible contains so many *improbable* stories, and the Iliad is, in all its relations, so *probable* and likely, that it *must* be believed! A historian, forsooth, must be a man of truth; his accounts and relations must bear witness to his integrity, and then credulity itself must be satisfied. The history of the celebrated retreat of the 10,000 Greeks, written by their commander, Xenophon, is so very reasonable, that no Deist, we presume, would hazard his reputation by denying its truth. What motive could Xenophon have had to induce him to lie; surely none, except to gain a name, and that would be too small an inducement to influence him in the least. Another thing, Xenophon must have written the history in question; and this could not have been the case, except the events actually happened which he narrated. But had the Iliad contained a *prophecy*, evidently promulgated hundreds of years before the destruction of the City of Troy, that the Trojans should be dispersed among all the nations of the earth after the destruction of their city, which should be foretold likewise, and that they should retain their religious principles and national peculiarities, complexion, character and language, and had the Trojans actually existed to this day in a dispersed state, every one bearing testimony to the truth of the destruction of their city, and possessing in their own persons the prophecy itself, it would, strange to relate, *prove* the whole to be false! Did the history of Xenophon contain a prophecy, that the Greeks should wander through a considerable part of Asia after the death of Cyrus, and their posterity be scattered over all the habitable world, and be a byword among all nations, and did this actually take place, it would, strange to tell, be an unanswerable argument against the truth of the history!

Deists pretend, that miracles are not satisfactory evidence of the truth of any thing. They must of necessity be above our comprehension, and consequently, instead of convincing, by informing our judgment, or aiding our reason, they set both at defiance, and demand a forced and blind assent to their existence or truth. The conduct of Deists is an excellent comment on these their premises. The celebrated Earl of Cherbury, the most distinguished deistical writer of his age, refused his assent to the Scriptures, because *he thought* they were *unnecessary*, and contained accounts of *miracles*, &c. He, however, in the plenitude of *his* wisdom, undertook the writing a book, which in his opinion was necessary; and to preserve his consistency, and aversion to miracles, *pretended*, that God by a *miracle* approved of *his* substitute for the Scriptures; and he then published, as *necessary* for the world, a *book*, to assist mankind in their knowledge of their Creator, at the same time professing to believe, that every thing of the kind was *unnecessary!* Such gross inconsistency and folly needs no comment. Man has indeed sought out inventions. Skepticism and infidelity, or superstition and bigotry, characterize the mass of mankind. How different from these, is the rational system and doctrine, promulgated by the Redeemer of the world. Unostentatious in his appearance, humble in his demeanor, meek and lowly in his carriage,—the purity of his precepts, the sublimity of his doctrine, his patience under suffering, mildness under rebuke, and the heavenly benevolence and charity which accompanied all his words and actions, shed a divine lustre upon all he said, or did;—and manifested the greatness of his personage, the holiness of his motives, and declared in united voice, the excellence of his mission, and the grandeur of a God!

Our correspondent will consider our remarks, thus far, as general; we have no disposition to offend; but, in our view of Deism, and examination of its merits, contrasted with the religion of Christ, we had rather offend, if truth will offend, than omit aught that has the least tendency to expose the errors of the one, or the divine excellency and harmony of the other. Our correspondent says, "he rejects with us, the doctrine of endless misery." Did he ever believe in this doctrine? And if he rejected the Sciptures, because he took it for granted they taught this doctrine, did he not act prematurely? Ought he not to have first examined them, and have satisfied himself, whether the Scriptures did not reject this doctrine likewise? We think he had. Our correspondent adds, "I do not see sufficiently clear to believe the Scriptures to be a revelation from God, or to believe in the divinity of Christ." He then introduces his objections. There were "*weak and wicked men*," who assembled in council at Nice and Laodicea, 350 years after Christ, and voted for the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, as we vote a law; a great many gospels were rejected; forty were offered, &c. Luke's was rejected at one council, but afterwards was received at another, &c. Just, says our correspondent, as the English Parliament *bastardized*, and afterwards legitimated Queen Elizabeth." We have no objection to admit all this for matter of fact. And we ask, what has all this to do with the question, relative to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments being a revelation from God? The men who composed these councils were not born, nor their great grandfathers before them, when these gospels were written. Their rejecting, or receiving them, was no argument in their favour.—What! refuse your assent to the truth of the Scriptures, because a convention of *weak* and *wicked men* hesitated about receiving them? If there is any weight to be attached to the circumstance of weak and wicked men tampering with the Scriptures and refusing to accredit them, it is in favour of the Scriptures, and not against them. And their finally receiving them, was an evidence, that there were some among them who were, comparatively, neither *weak*, nor *wicked* men. If the Scriptures are true, they are true of themselves,—and if they are false, they are false of themselves. The *reception*, or *rejection* of them, by all the world, would neither make them true nor false! They stand on their own bottom. Congregated worlds can neither add to their truth, nor diminish their authenticity. It is the height of absurdity, for men to talk about making things *true*, or *false*. And the fact, which our correspondent has introduced to illustrate and add weight to his objections; that the English Parliament bastardized, and afterwards legitimated Queen Elizabeth, is an unanswerable argument against the ground of reasoning which he has based his cause on. Is it possible for all men in the aggregate to legitimate or bastardize a child? No! If a child is born illegitimate, and all the world declare that the child is legitimate, it does not legitimate the child; and *vice versa*. Suppose all the legislative and deliberative assemblies on this globe, were to declare in solemn convention, that the book entitled "Robinson Crusoe" was a revelation from heaven, would their declarations make it so? Our correspondent says, there was 40 gospels offered at the councils at Nice and Laodicea; granted,—how many gospels are offered in the 60 churches in New-York? Are not these churches *councils* or conventions of people, and do they not *reject*, as orthodox, or heretical, whatever meets and *receives* their approbation, or disagrees with their views? They do. It is said, there are seventeen different religious sects in this city, and is it possible for them to *differ* without having different gospels? We think not.—Is it not rational to account for the circumstance of 40 gospels, or written manuscripts, being presented to the councils at Nice and Laodicea, by supposing that *weak* and *wicked* men would, from a spirit of pride, or fanaticism, attempt to introduce, either their own productions, or some of their fellows, as divine, and binding upon the consciences of men? Look at the occurrences of our own age; recollect the many attempts which have been made to palm upon mankind human works and compositions, for the inspiration and commands of God? Go back to the time of Mahomet, behold him, employed writing his Alcoran,—declaring that he left this earth, and had interviews with the inhabitants of heaven,—contrast this book, the Alcoran, with the Bible,—examine his pretended miracles, and the astonishing difference between the two is manifest in every particular. It is notorious, that Mahomet's gospel has no evidence but his own declaration to support it; not so the gospel of Christ. Mahomet ascended to heaven, as himself relates, in the gloom of night, from the obscurity of his own closet,—Christ ascended at mid-day, in the presence of many witnesses; he was seen to mount the concave firmament, and ascend the steeps of heaven! We, however, feel it due to the cause we advocate, to declare, that all we have written relative to the objections of our correspondent, in his account of the councils, &c. is perfectly gratuitous; his objections are unworthy the name; and want only a little activity and power of motion given them, to turn all their force against their employer.

We have already adverted to the fact, that Deists are found only in those countries, where the Scriptures are known. At first view, it would seem, as though the Scriptures were the cause of this infidelity. This, however, is not the case. The Scriptures are made instrumental by the abominable constructions which a class of people "nick-named" divines, have put upon them. Deism is one remove from paganism. And Deists are indebted to the Scriptures they so much deride, for this *their* pre-eminence. The celebrated Rousseau, infidel as he was, acknowledged this, when he confessed, that "natural religion was in a great measure derived from the Scriptures." Deism is, at best, but a negative principle; and the remorse and inquietude which Deists so frequently experience, is a strong evidence that with all their boasted wisdom, they are still inferior in one respect to the ancient pagans. The philosophers of Greece and Rome boasted of their superior wisdom; Deism was a science to which they were strangers,—the Scriptures they never

* Thucydides is the next historian who has given any account of the City of Troy. He lived about 700 years after the fall of Troy. And Homer wrote his Iliad about 200 years after the fall of Troy. Consequently, we have no account of the history of the Trojans, written by a person who lived in the age of Troy. And considering the time that transpired from the destruction of that city, before Thucydides wrote his account of it, the whole weight of evidence must rest with Homer.

saw,—and they gloried in their contempt of death, and in rising above the little ills which life is heir too,—to pass the barrier of mortality with the same indifference and unconcern which they would manifest in rising from the table after a full repast, was with them the *ne plus ultra* of human greatness, the *acme* of human wisdom. Not so the Christian,—he considers, that "not a sparrow falls to the ground, without his heavenly Father's knowledge." To be indifferent, is to be criminal,—his hopes are founded upon certainty,—death is, with him, the commencement of life, and instead of regarding it with indifference, he rejoices to leave the tabernacle of clay for the heavenly mansion, and to exchange his "body of sin and death," for the glorious image of his Saviour and his God!

(To be Continued.)

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—In looking over your 15th Number of the Gospel Herald, in your remarks upon Philotheus, you challenge him or any other person, to show one condition towards man's salvation. I shall do no more at present, than to direct you to the following passages of Scripture, and ask you if there are not conditions in them. Luke 13th chap. 2d, 3d, and 5th verses, will a man perish that repents? will he not perish if he does not repent? Suppose you were going down Broadway, a man should knock you down. You immediately reply, if you will repent of this savage act, I will not seek satisfaction from you. Now, Sir, how is this man's discharge? Is it not upon condition of repentance? Mark 16th chap. 16th verse, Will a man be saved if he does not believe? Is he not saved by believing? Matthew 7th chap. 7th verse Will it be given if we do not ask? will it be opened if we do not knock?

Please to excuse all the errors in this short epistle.

I am, Sir, Your Friend,
MILETUM.

REMARKS.

Our correspondent says, "In your remarks on Philotheus, you challenge him, or any other person, to show *one* condition *towards* man's salvation." We hope in future, every one who may come forward to controvert any of our declarations, will be so kind as *first* to read them attentively, and understand their import. We made no such declaration as the one above quoted. The word *towards*, in the sense our correspondent has used it, is very equivocal. We stated, the *condition* must be *definite*; and declared this would be a SINE QUA NON. Wishing, however, to be impartial, and to prevent even the possibility of a shadow of colour of reason, which can be brought in the shape of an objection against us, we proceed to notice the passages to which our attention is directed, &c.

And first, Luke 13th chap. 2d, 3d, and 5th verses, and we shall take the liberty to *add* the 4th verse, which, we think, would even have satisfied our correspondent, had he attentively considered its meaning. "And Jesus answering, said unto them, suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners *above all* Galileans, *because* they suffered such things? I tell you, *nay*; but except ye repent, ye shall all *likewise* perish. Or those eighteen upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, *think ye that they were sinners above all men* that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, *nay*; but except ye repent, ye shall all *likewise* perish." Our correspondent must *first prove*, that the *perishing* here spoken of is the *perishing* of *the soul*, and is *for ever*; and further, explain the *repenting*, and tell what is to be done, &c. and if he can prove that it is the *soul*, which is *crushed*, by the *fall* of a *building*, and *point* out, and *explain* the *extent*, and *quality* of the *repentance* which is to *prevent* it, we shall acknowledge that we are WRONG! But, until this is done, we shall take it for granted, that we are RIGHT! Mark, 16th chap. 16th verse, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Our correspondent, if he had examined our remarks on Philotheus, would have seen, that he is to *tell what it is that we are to believe*, the *belief* of *which* will *save* us. And we would suggest to him, that an inquiry into the nature of the *damnation* spoken of would be useful; and as Paul has declared that "God hath concluded *all* in *unbelief*, that he might have *mercy* upon *all*;" we would likewise ask him, whether, those who are *damned* for *not believing*, are not *included* among *those*, of whom Paul speaks, as being *concluded* in *unbelief*; and if this damnation is eternal *misery* without *end*, when will God have *mercy* on them? Our correspondent's next and last quotation, is the 7th chap. of Matthew, 7th verse. "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." He ought to have recollected, that he was bound to tell *what it is* that *we* are to *ask for*, &c. We are sorry that our correspondent has been so remiss in his undertaking. Surely he cannot expect us to acknowledge *his* conditions to be conditions, unless they express in plain terms, the *price* and the *article*. In all the conditional concerns of life, in all its variety of trade, bargain, covenant and agreement, the conditions are plainly stated, and obvious to all; but in this, the most important concern of the soul, it is all uncertainty in the price, and uncertainty relative to the article bought. Suppose our correspondent was to inquire the *price* of a *coat*, and the seller was to tell him, there is *good news* from England; if you will *believe* it, you shall *have* the *coat*; our correspondent would naturally ask, well, *tell me* what the *news is*, and I will believe it,—O it is *good news!* But how can I *believe* the *news*, unless I know what it is? O you must believe!—you must have faith, you must believe, you must have *saving* faith, or, as it would be in this case, you must believe the *news*, and then your *old coat will turn into a new one!* According to our correspondent's doctrine, we presume the *salvation* of the *soul* is for *sale*, and we think he is at *least* bound to tell the price, and what *kind* of money will be received in payment!

For the Gospel Herald.

INSECTILE CALVINISM.

A certain Calvinistic Baptist, has recently uttered the following expression, which we can abundantly prove if required, namely, "I fully believe there are *infants* in *hell* not *bigger* than *bumble bees!*" If so, the unhappy woman who unfortunately drowned her innocent children, with the view of preventing their eternal misery, may be awfully disappointed, and may yet behold those little innocents writhing in all the agonies of wo, and mingling their screeches with the non-elect, whose infernal screams give equal delight to *saints* in *heaven* and *devils in hell!*

Superstition! How hast thou cast the veil of darkness over thy deluded votaries! But soon shall the rays of that light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, divest thee of thy influence, and drive thee from thy murky den!

Question. If innocent babes are to be eternally roasted in the furnace of hell to satiate the malice of devils, is it not our duty to murder all those, who have arrived to years of maturity, to prevent the further increase of infants?

Think of it, ye *Insectile* Calvinists!

AMPHILIUS.

"Lo, children are the *heritage* of the *Lord*, and the fruit of the womb is *his* reward!"

SCRIPTURE.

"*Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Matthew*, v. 11.

The above is the declaration of Christ; and in our opinion, contains more than is generally supposed. We believe the common understanding of this passage, is, that men are blessed, when they are persecuted for following the example of Christ, by a meek and lowly carriage in their intercourse with mankind, and for living an honest life, and conducting towards all in a tender and affectionate manner. We do not presume to say, that no man was ever persecuted for this,—but we do say that we never knew a man to be persecuted for this cause. We believe the worst man living would prefer an honest man as a neighbour, and would deal with him in a pecuniary manner in preference to a rogue; and more, a wrangling quarrelsome man, would prefer a peaceable neighbour to one of his own cast. "A soft answer turneth away wrath." Persecution has its origin from the same cause, which produces wars and fightings. And wars and fightings proceed from the lusts of men,—therefore, a reviling, persecuting spirit proceeds from the lusts of the reviler or persecutor. Can it be possible, that a man should, for the sake, or with a view to honour, or advance the kingdom and glory of Christ, persecute and revile his fellow? Is not the bare supposition of such conduct, proceeding from so inconsistent a motive, absurd and preposterous? It is. What, then, are we to understand by a man's reviling, and persecuting, and saying all manner of evil against another *falsely for Christ's sake*? Let us first inquire, what it is that Christ *requires of us*, and, then, we may understand the declaration of Christ. And, first, we have the words of Christ in answer to the Jews, who asked him, saying, "What shall *we do*, that we might *work* the *works* of God? Jesus answered, and said unto them,—*This* is the *work* of God, that *ye believe* on *him* whom *he* hath *sent*." And Christ declared, that he "came, not to *judge* the *world*, but to *save* the world." And Christ again declared, that "he had finished the work," &c. And speaking of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, he said, "He would reprove the world of sin, because they believe not on me." We are then to believe, "that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the world!" Did any of the apostles believe this, and were they "reviled and persecuted" for their belief? Paul testified that he was reviled and persecuted for this, and this alone. Paul said, "We therefore both labour and suffer reproach, *because* we *trust* in the living God, who is the *Saviour* of *all men*, specially of those that believe." When Paul *trusted* to his *own works*, and his *own righteousness*, there was *no labour*, nor *reproach*; but the moment he declared that he *believed* Jesus Christ to be the *Saviour* of the *world*, and testified that we are "*Saved* by *grace through faith*, and *that* not," *even the faith* "of ourselves, it is the *gift* of God,"—Paul no sooner made a confession of this faith, than he was persecuted. It is notorious in this, our day, that if a man *trusts* in the living God, as the *Saviour* of *all men*, reviling and persecution as certainly follow, as effect follows cause. And more,—it is a *notorious fact*,—that there are those, who *pretend* to *do all* for Christ's *sake*, who FALSELY *revile* and *persecute*, by declaring,—"That the DEIST, who pronounces the *Saviour* Jesus Christ, *to have been* an ILLEGITIMATE *impostor! is*, of the *two*, far *preferable* to those who *believe* Christ to be the *Son* of *God*, and the Saviour of the WORLD,—ALL MEN! We repeat it,—This, is a NOTORIOUS FACT!—And this alone speaks volumes.

We, therefore, see the emphatic meaning of Christ in his declaration, "Speak all manner of evil against you *falsely* for my sake." And we ask, can any thing be more *false*, than for a man to revile, and speak evil of another, for believing in the oath and declarations of Jehovah, that "all nations whom he has made shall come and worship before him,"—and at the same time *pretend* that it is for the *sake* of Christ that he *reviles*, speaks evil, and persecutes?

Reader,—Hear the words of Christ. "By this shall all know that ye are my disciples, IF *ye* have *love*, *one* to *another!*" This is the balance. Beware, lest you read on the wall of your conscience, TEKEL!

To Correspondents.

J. B. and Mary, will appear in our next.

All Communications forwarded to the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter-box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold-Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICE.

*** Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454, Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.
EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 19, 1820. NO. 18.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Answer to an "Inquirer after Truth."

(Continued.)

Our correspondent says, "I do not see sufficiently clear to believe the Scriptures to be a revelation from God." We would suggest to him the propriety of making out a *schedule* of every thing, that he believes on evidence, other than that, which his own personal knowledge and experience have convinced him is true. Is there any thing which he believes, and which he never saw with his eyes, or felt with his hands, or heard with his ears? Is he in the habit of refusing his assent to the truth of every occurrence, which happens out of his reach, or beyond his sight? If so, we think him in a very *doubtful* state; but if he ever suffers his judgment, or any of his mental faculties, to wander from home, and assent to the truth of any proposition, thing or principle, beyond the sphere of his own action, or out of sight of the "smoke of his own chimney," we think he can believe a little more, without absolutely forfeiting his reputation for *prudence* and *sagacity*. Does he believe there is a God, the maker and upholder of all things? Then he believes that God made him, and upholds him. Does he believe that he has faculties of mind superior to matter, powers of perception, comparison, and judgment to decide, relative to the comparative importance, or utility of things, one with another? He *must* believe God gave him these powers and perceptions; and if they are useful, he must believe God gave them to him that he might use them. Does he make use of them, and does he not find that they are correct, and under certain restrictions which are imposed by his reason, a power which God gave him, he can rely with certainty on his *own*, and the *judgment* and *testimony* of others? This much granted, and we believe it *cannot* be denied, the Deist is under an imperious obligation, founded on the deductions of his own premises, and the fruit of his own principles, to believe every thing relating to his God, which is based on evidence of *equal weight* and *veracity*, with that *evidence*, which has already and repeatedly produced his assent and belief from others. We believe it is *absolutely impossible* to disprove these premises. They are compatible with every principle of reason,—they are sanctioned by the experience of ages,—and it is on these premises, or these principles, that mankind by universal consent govern themselves in all the ordinary and useful concerns of life. Nay more,—we appeal to Deists themselves for the truth of these declarations; and if they deny them, they know, that in so doing they will give the lie to *all* their *motives* and *actions!* We repeat it,—this can *never* be controverted,—here is *strong ground* from which we *never* can be *driven*, so long as the power of judging is delegated to man, or reason shall continue to assist, or govern his conclusions! We now request the attention of our correspondent to the evidences we shall produce in favour of the declaration, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are a revelation from God to man. And if the evidences and proof, which we shall produce in favour of this declaration, is as great, or greater, than the evidence he has at any time received as satisfactory proof of the existence of any thing, or principle, among men, we shall be justified in demanding of him a *reason* for his refusing his assent to their truth, and he will forfeit all claims to rationality and consistency if he refuses to give it, or, if when given, it shall not be sufficient to justify his conduct.

Previously, however, to producing these evidences, it is proper to examine into the situation of mankind anterior to the promulgation of the Scriptures, and to prove by this inquiry, the falsity of the declaration of Deists, that "all *revelation* was *unnecessary*." We believe, that for a thing to be *proved* to be *unnecessary*, it must be *proved*, that its introduction, or use, would not produce the least advantage. Now, if Deists could prove, that a revelation from God to man *could* do *no* good; or that what we call a revelation from God to man, *has done no good*, they would be *correct*, but until they prove this, we think their declaration is entitled to no credit whatever. Greece and Rome, according to the position of Deists, could not be benefited by a revelation from heaven. They stood pre-eminent in their knowledge of the arts and sciences. Even in our day, their eloquence and accomplishments are a theme of wonder and astonishment to many; and their knowledge of languages is considered a criterion to guide the scholar, and their arts a rule to instruct and amuse the learned. It cannot therefore be pretended, that they were ignorant of those things which are taught by nature, independent of revelation; or that they did not improve the means which nature afforded them, seeing they far outstripped the then other nations of the earth, and equalled, if not exceeded in many things, the present civilized world. To what shall we impute this improvement, so far exceeding other nations of their day? If we ask the Atheist, he will tell us, that it was "all the effect of chance." But the Deist, to preserve his consistency as a rational creature, and not deny his own premises, for he believes in God the Creator, must acknowledge, that the Greeks and Romans received knowledge from God; that God gave them their faculties of mind, by which they *scanned* his works, and from the works of God, or nature, they derived their knowledge. We think it, therefore, evident, that nature cannot teach man any thing foreign to, or beyond nature. *And if man is immortal, it is necessary that the immortal God should reveal himself to man, and man to himself.* Were man the creature of an hour, was the earth his origin, home and end, the case would be altered. A revelation concerning things, which were in every respect foreign or irrelevant to him, would be useless. And if man is immortal, and destined to another state and mode of being, a revelation of that state and mode of being, can no more be unnecessary, than a knowledge of the things relative to man's present state and mode of being can be unnecessary and useless to him, in, and during his present state and mode of being. We presume that Deists will not deny this, so long as they *pretend*, that nature teaches man a future state. The reasonings, falsely so called, of a class of infidels who pretend to deny the immortality of the soul, are too absurd and foolish to merit an answer. We have conversed with the hoary headed *traitor* to every rational principle, and heard with pity and astonishment, premises, which outraged every principle which is found within the pale of rationality. This can be nothing less than insanity. From whence, then, proceeded the knowledge of the sages of Greece and Rome? *Ans.* From nature,—From whence proceeded nature? *Ans.* From God! Nature is the instrument in the hands of the Creator, of informing his creatures. Nature is a revelation of the being, attributes and purposes of God. But that man of himself should learn of nature all that is necessary of the being, attributes and purposes of God, is contrary to the history and experience of all the nations who have ever inhabited this globe. The state of knowledge of Greece and Rome in their greatest improvement, and their profound ignorance of the being, character and purposes of God, as related to themselves in their situation as immortal and accountable creatures, is an incontrovertible argument against the position, that *a further revelation from God was unnecessary.* Among the Grecian philosophers, Socrates stood pre-eminent; and it is well known, that even with him, the immortality of the soul was rather a matter of speculation, than certainty; and that he rather hoped than believed, and wished than expected it true. And when it is considered that Socrates and his associates expressed their conviction, that a revelation was necessary to instruct man relative to a future state or the method of worshipping his Maker, and it is likewise considered, that there existed an astonishing difference between Socrates and the common people of Greece in point of information, the profound ignorance of a large proportion of the ancients in things relating to God and futurity, must be abundantly manifest. Even Socrates, the wisest of them all, while dying, enjoined it upon his friends to sacrifice a fowl to Esculapius. If we take into consideration their temples dedicated to idols; their numerous Deities, their superstition, and the confidence they placed in the answers of oracles, and in signs and auguries, it will be evident that they had much to learn, and possessed nothing which could any way enlighten or instruct them. If we turn to Rome, the seat of empire and the arts, we shall find the most astonishing ignorance of every thing relating to God and futurity. The declaration of Seneca, one of the wisest of the Romans, "That death is nothing, and reduces every thing to nothing, and that the tranquillity of the dead is the same with that of those who are not born,—and that

at death we return to the elements whence we came, and lose all personal existence;"* is, at best, but a negative and gloomy consolation. Is there a modern infidel who would pride himself upon giving birth to the sentiments of Zeno, that *pity is unworthy of a wise man?* "That external things are neither *good* nor *evil;* and that to be stretched on a *rack*, or to repose on a bed of *roses*, are, to a *wise* man, matters of equal and absolute *indifference?* From this principle it would require no profound skill in logic, and the Stoics were deep logicians, to infer, that, by robbing a wise man of his money, cutting off his leg or arm, stealing his child, or murdering his friend, they only took that from him on which he set no value. That men ought to be resigned to the divine will, but that, when any thing vexed them, they had an undoubted right to make away with themselves, after the example of Zeno, who in a pet hanged himself, because he had hurt his finger!"† Cicero, who is held in as high estimation as any of the Romans, testified, that "the greater part of those whom antiquity honoured with the name of philosophers, were men of loose principles and bad morals. Many of them disgraced human reason by their profligate tenets and sophistical wrangling; and some of them, by their impudence, buffoonery, and beastliness, were a disgrace to human nature." Where should we in our days expect to find, except among the Hottentots and Pagans, men examining and consulting the entrails of animals, and seeking from their appearance, and from the flight of birds, counsel and advice to guide and direct them in their most important transactions? And such was the practice of these celebrated and enlightened Romans, when Rome was at the greatest pitch of her grandeur, and at the height of her power, giving laws to kings, and ruling the then civilized, as well as the barbarian world.

It must, therefore, be conceded, that the ancient Greeks and Romans, especially their philosophers, and learned men, possessed all the knowledge which could be derived from nature unassisted by revelation. If this is not the case, where shall we find *facts* or *premises* to prove the contrary. If we go to the other nations cotemporary with the Greeks and Romans, we find a sad picture of ignorance, superstition, idolatry, and depravity. We find man, whom God placed at the head of his creatures, ignorant of his destination; superstitiously worshipping idols, the work of men's hands,—deifying beasts and reptiles, and guilty of the most flagitious and abominable crimes and impurities. Is it not astonishing, that men can be found, professing to be wiser than their fellows, who, notwithstanding all these facts relative to the ignorance of mankind, declare, that their condition could not be improved, or what is the same, that any revelation from God was unnecessary?

That God revealed to the people called Jews, a knowledge of his being, attributes and purposes, by his prophets, whom he inspired with this knowledge; is a fact, which admits of the strongest possible proof. And that the Jews have preserved this knowledge, which God communicated through the medium of his prophets, in that book called the Scriptures, or Old Testament, is likewise susceptible of the strongest possible proof. And that "*life* and *immortality* are brought to *light* by the *gospel*" of Jesus Christ, who was *God manifest* in the *flesh*, is likewise a fact, which can be *proved*, beyond the *possibility* of *refutation*. There is one *fact*, which Deists are *compelled* to *admit;* and which, once admitted, destroys in a moment all the force of their arguments and objections. It is the fact, that the book called the Bible or Old Testament, is a book of *great antiquity*. They know that it is in vain to deny it. Necessity, therefore, has extorted from them a confession, which leaves them without any foundation for their positions and declarations. They are likewise obliged to acknowledge that the Jews are an ancient people; that they have been identified as a distinct nation, more than two thousand years. These *facts* once *acknowledged*, and acknowledged they *must be*, and Deism totters to its foundation. The infidel has no longer any hope of victory, but must quit the field, or leave his *carcass* where thousands of his progenitors in unbelief have fallen before him. It is notorious, that every position which the Deist assumes defeats himself. The Deist professes to believe, that miracles are impossibilities. He declares, that they are contrary to nature. Consequently, nothing short of the Omnipotent power of God can produce a miracle. To foretel future events is contrary to nature; it, therefore, constitutes a miracle. There is no man in possession of his reason who will pretend to tell with exactness any thing which shall happen 2000 years hence. And no Deist will presume to deny, but that the Old Testament has been written 2000 years at *least*. And no Deist *can* deny that the Bible contains a prophecy relative to the Jews, of a most surprising nature, which has been fulfilled, and is continually fulfilling before their eyes every day of their lives. Deists make no distinction or limitation in their objections to, or denial of the Scriptures. In this one particular they are necessarily consistent. Therefore, if only a small part of the Scriptures can be supported, or proved to be truth, they are under obligations to show a want of connexion and positive disagreement in the remainder; for the presumption, even in this case, would be strong against them. But when it is considered that the Bible is *one* great outline, and that this outline is interwoven one part with another, to that degree, that the truth of a part, of necessity, supposes the truth of the whole, and it inevitably follows, that any prominent part of the Scriptures which is of necessity true, guarantees the truth of the rest, in proportion as it is connected with the rest. We presume even Deists themselves will acknowledge, if they will take the trouble to read the Bible in order, as they would read any history, the manifest connexion and agreement in what to them might appear its most prominent parts. And they would likewise be necessitated to acknowledge, that the nation called Jews or Israelites, are mentioned in the Scriptures, and their history so closely interwoven with the general contents of the Scriptures, and the purpose which the Scriptures testifies is the purpose of God, is likewise connected with their history, and the whole so blended and united, that to sever that part relating to the Jews from the Scriptures, they would be left in a very imperfect and unconnected state; therefore, if these premises are true, and for the truth of them we appeal to the Scriptures and to the rational world of mankind, without distinction of religion, sect, or party, it follows of consequence, that if that part of the Scriptures is truth, which relates to these Jews or Israelites, that the remainder is likewise as worthy of credit as any revelation can be which mankind accredit, without positive testimony evident to their own senses, and is deserving of belief, until *proved* to be *false*. We, therefore, declare, that the 28th chap. of Deuteronomy, and the Jews or Israelites, and they are both evident, and obvious to our senses, *is an incontrovertible evidence* in favour of the declaration, "That the Scriptures are a revelation from God." We challenge all the Deists in creation to produce any thing, which has even the shadow of resemblance, which, by any reasonable construction, can be considered as a *parallel*. And we appeal to the consciences of Deists themselves, for the truth of the declaration, that all creation does not contain a *parallel!* We have said this prophecy was written 2000 years ago; we appeal to the consciences of those Deists, who are conversant with books and ancient history, whether they do not believe that this book, containing this prophecy, was written more than 3000 years ago! We mean that part of the Scriptures, designated as the book of Deuteronomy. Deists pretend, that the Scriptures were written by men, without any command or advice from God relative to them. If Deists believe, that a man, or any number of men, could write the history of a nation, for 3000 years, and not miss one particular in their account of what should befall 90 generations of men, and this written before these 90 generations of men were born, they have *more credulity* than all the superstitious and ignorant of all nations, kindreds, tongues and people, in the world, have had before them. And further, they believe that to be truth, which their own constant experience, and the experience of every person of whom they have the least knowledge, tells them, in *strong* and *impressive* language, is FALSE! We consider this evidence to be conclusive. It sets even skepticism at defiance; and admits of no possibility of misconstruction, for the facts are obvious to all, and all must acknowledge them; and of the *two*, it is far more consistent and rational to believe the prophecy to be truth, and to be prophecy, than to acknowledge the fact, *which must be done*, and outrage every rational principle to account for it! Our correspondent is requested to turn to the 2d Number of this paper, 6th and 7th pages, where this *prophecy* relative to the Jewish nation is more particularly considered.

Our correspondent says, he does not *see evidence* sufficiently clear to *believe* in the *divinity* of Christ. We think it important in this inquiry, to *understand* the *meaning* of the *words* we *use*. It is our opinion that the word *divinity*, as applied to Christ, is *differently* understood by *different* persons. Now, we believe it *means emphatically*, that the Divine, Eternal, and uncreated God, dwelt in Christ; and that Christ's *divinity*, is this Divine, Eternal, and uncreated God, who is before all things—and by, and of whom, are all things,—to whom *alone* be glory *for ever*. AMEN! Any thing short of this *reduces* Christ to a *level* with *man*. More than this cannot be! There is no medium,—it is *either* God, or man. We, therefore, understand our correspondent to say, that he cannot *understand* how *Christ can*

* De Consolat. ad Marc. cap. 19. † Diogenes Laertius.

he God. We do not make this arrangement with a view to mislead our correspondent, or to avoid any supposed difficulty which might arise from his arrangement; but we can see no other possible shape, in which the question under consideration can be viewed. We believe the word *divine*, strictly speaking, can only with propriety be applied to God the Creator. And if God the Creator dwelt in Christ, there was a *union* and *oneness*, an *indivisible*, and indissoluble affinity and union between God the *Spirit*, and man, or human nature in the *person* of Christ, who is the Head of human nature, and the Head of every man. To prove this, we shall not quote many passages. We think, that ONE, if understood, is as good as an *hundred*; for except *all* the *declarations* of Christ are *true*, not *one* of them is entitled to the least consideration; for we have no rule to mark the distinction, if there is a distinction. Therefore, *all*, or *none* are to be *received*. Christ declared, "I and the Father are ONE!" It is not in the power of human reason to conceive a more *simple unequivocal* declaration than this. And if the Deist, or any other man refuses his assent to the truth of Christ's declaration on account of what to him may appear *mysterious* in this *union*, we reply, that on the same principle he may *refuse* to *believe* that his *soul* and *body* are united; for *one* is as mysterious as the *other!* It is well worthy of remark, that man can only judge of *cause* from *effect*,—there never lived a man who could judge of *effect* from the *cause*. For a man to attempt to reason and judge *a priori*, would be attended with the same success, which has rewarded the efforts of the many, who have laboured (not to find, for that could easily be done, but) to *make* a *motion* which should be *perpetual*. If Deists were to reason *a posteriori*, and where they find *effect*, acknowledge a *prior* and *producing* cause; and would honestly confess, what to them *must* of necessity be evident, that the *cause* must be *greater* than the *effect*, we firmly believe there would not be a Deist on this globe,—NO! NOT ONE!—And more,—We believe, if mankind universally were to observe this *only possible* correct rule of construction, there would not be found *one* man, who believed in an unmerciful God, infinite sin, or never-ending misery! We do not recollect any Deist who has denied the fact, that Christ was crucified at the time, and in the manner related by his disciples. It would be in vain to deny this. It must be acknowledged; there is no other alternative. In our opinion, this *fact*, once acknowledged, and *Deism* is without *one* solitary *hold* to retreat to. The cause is worse than hopeless; it is a mere *chimera*, a delusion. For this Jesus, whom they acknowledge was crucified, dead and buried; was afterwards seen alive, by five hundred men at one time; and his apostles declared to his murderers, publicly, that he was risen from the dead, and they *could not deny it!* And this public appeal, were Jesus not risen, would have produced an immediate and final conviction of their falsehood.

The book entitled, the Old and New Testaments, has been handed down from one generation to another until the present day. And were our knowledge of the facts and doctrines contained and taught in this book altogether traditional, its uncertainty would be manifest. But when it is considered, that if it is objected that the art of printing was not known to the ancients, that it would have the same weight against all history and every manuscript of every kind; it would, we think, even make Deists hesitate relative to the propriety of receiving it as an objection. There is one very remarkable fact, which is worthy of serious attention, that there is no book, or manuscript extant, written in, or near the age of Christ and his apostles, denying the truth of the events stated to have happened in the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John. How is this to be accounted for? Were the events which the evangelists record of such public notoriety, that no man ventured to deny them? Or shall we suppose, that they were written against, and the manuscripts lost or destroyed? That the first believers in Christ would answer and refute any writing which in their day appeared against their Lord and his gospel, we think does not admit of a doubt. And the circumstance of a believer in Christ, who lived after the days of the apostles, answering an unbeliever, and *copying* all the *work* he wrote *against*, and by that means preserving *it* with his *own*, which has descended to our day, is, we think, good proof, that very few in the early ages of Christianity had the hardihood to publicly deny, what was well known to be truth. And further, had such writings existed, and if they by some untoward circumstances were destroyed, still it is almost impossible but some of the many works which have existed to our day, would have noticed them. It is notorious that the Jews, so far from denying the miracles of Christ, admitted them from necessity, but attributed them to a power, which they asserted Christ derived from devils. How, then, could those things be denied, which were so evident and public, that even Christ's bitterest foes and murderers were obliged to confess were truth, and who availed themselves of the only possible method to discountenance Christ, by accusing him of being in allegiance with devils.—There is one fact, which speaks volumes in favour of the divinity of Christ, and which is of itself a complete refutation of the Unitarian heresy which is *attempted* to be promulgated and *proved* in this city,—it destroys in a moment all the *quibbles* of these *system makers*, and leaves them unsupported by every thing but *their own vanity!*—namely,—The Jews, who were cotemporary with Christ, and who heard his declarations from his own mouth, declared, that He, being, in their opinion, man, made himself God. And the declaration of Christ, which is in perfect conformity with the declaration of the Jews, namely, "I, and my Father are ONE!" is an incontrovertible argument against those idolaters, who distinguish themselves as Trinitarians, and who declare, that Christ and the Father are THREE! Relative to the divinity of Christ, it *stands* or *falls* with the Scriptures. And there cannot be greater folly or inconsistency, than to admit *one*, and deny the *other!* It is, we think, conclusive, that Christ told the Jews, that he was greater than Jonah, or Solomon, and before Abraham. And assumed the title or appellation, which belongs to God alone; and told the Jews, "If you believe not, that I Am, ye shall die in your sins." From which it is evident, that the sins alluded to, is the sin of unbelief, that Christ is God, agreeable to the declaration of Christ, that the Holy Spirit the Comforter, would "reprove the world of *sin*, because they believe not on me." And Christ's declaration, "If you believe not that I Am," must either prove, that the Holy Spirit, which is God, will reprove the world for doing right, if Christ is not divine, or God, for the world and the Jews do not believe that he is God.—Consequently, if the world believed Christ was the I Am, or Father, or God, they would not be reproved by the Holy Spirit! If this is not conclusive, there is no such thing as language ever meaning any thing,—and it is impossible to arrange words in such a manner, as to express any *thing* or *principle* with *certainty!* Reason teaches us, that the *flesh* and *bones* of the *visible* body of Christ, as he appeared to the Jews, was not God, any more than a man's visible body is his *spirit!* And Christ himself corroborates this; for after he had risen from the dead, he said to his disciples, "A spirit hath not *flesh* and *bones* as ye see me have." Consequently, the *visible body* of Christ was not God. And when Thomas, one of his disciples, who would not believe, except he could "put his finger into the print of the nails, and thrust his hand into his side," after satisfying himself in these particulars, acknowledged Christ, by saying, "My Lord, and my God." Had Christ been a *creature*, he would have rebuked Thomas for thus exalting him to an equality with the Highest He would have said, "See thou do it not; for I am a creature like yourself." Instead of this, he declared to the Jews, with high, and I may add, with authority which alone belongs to Jehovah, "If ye believe not that I AM! ye shall die in your sins!" Our correspondent can now see the advantage which results from this belief. For it is impossible for a man to believe that "Christ is the Saviour of the *world*, of *all* men, of *every* man," without believing that Christ is God; for God only can save; and it is impossible for a man to believe this, without believing God or Christ is his Saviour;—therefore, he cannot die in his sins,—for he believes Christ has *saved* him *from* his sins. Here *alone* is *certainty*. For it is impossible for any man to believe, except the suggestions of the most egregious *vanity* is belief, that he is saved from his sins by Christ, *except* he believes that Christ is the Saviour of all men! We repeat it,—there is no other alternative,—God the Saviour of *all* men,—or, the man *saves himself*,—or is like a *good Pharisee*, *humble* enough to believe that *he* is *better* than the *Publican*, and his *vanity* for the time being in his own opinion *cheats the devil!* If there is any other *way* of salvation discovered, we should like to hear of *it*.

The fact, that Christ *healed* the *sick*, restored *sight* to the *blind*, and *feet* to the *lame*; and whose voice even pierced the ear of the dead, and restored *life* to the unconscious putrid mass, which constituted all the remains of Lazarus, was attested by men, who persisted in their declaration to the last moment of their lives, and finally suffered death in defence of what they believed and knew to be truth. There has been instances of men, who have suffered death, rather than betray their friends and violate their honour, but we believe the annals of the world cannot furnish a solitary instance of a man, who ever persisted to the last moment in *affirming* to the *truth* of what he knew to be *false*, and who suffered *death*, for *lying*, when he might have *lived* by *acknowledging* the *truth!* What can human reason or ingenuity conceive, which could operate as a motive to induce twelve men to declare, that Jesus Christ, whom the Jews publicly crucified and killed, was *risen from* the dead, and to suffer the most *cruel*, *constant*, and afflicting suffering and opprobrium, and finally to submit to death in its most appalling forms; what, but a sense of duty, a firm conviction of the truth of their declarations, could arm them with resolution to bear up against a world of persecutors and foes? Nothing short of truth could have supported them under such tremendous circumstances. There is but one way to get by this,—and that is boldly to assert, that these men could not tell black from white, and did not know what they were talking about! This would proclaim them idiots at once. Then the grand difficulty would be to account for the circumstance of idiots conducting, with such astonishing fortitude and consistency, which would exceed human reason to account for, and even credulity itself to believe. Is it possible to conceive of a number of men, foregoing all the enjoyments of domestic life and society, and voluntarily enduring hardships, persecution and death, with no other motive to stimulate them, but the propagation of a falsehood, so evident, (for evident it must have been if Christ had been an impostor, and not risen from the dead,) that all the world would cry shame upon them for this lying effrontery, and which could not benefit them in the least possible manner imaginable? If a man is not entitled to belief, when he seals his declaration with his heart's blood, and persists in his affirmation to his last breath, amidst the most excruciating torments which imagination can conceive, there neither is, nor can be any such thing as evidence,—and we may, nay we must, not only question, but disbelieve the convictions of our own judgment, and deny the evidences of our own senses,—nay more, I would deny my own existence; my doubts should fix me to the earth,—and I would *die* an INFIDEL, and *rot* a FOOL!

(To be concluded next week)

COMMUNICATION.

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR,—If you should think the following extract, taken from Rev. Mr. Evinan's SKETCH OF ALL DENOMINATIONS, worthy of a place in your paper, it may be the means of informing some, that many worthy men have espoused the sentiment of the universal and unchangeable love of God towards man, who were not members of a Universalist Society; yet they were not afraid to acknowledge their faith before an unregenerate and unmerciful

generation. The Author says, "The Universalists, properly so called, are those, who believe, that as Christ died for all, so before he shall have delivered up his mediatorial kingdom to the Father, *all* shall be brought to a participation of the benefits of his death, in their restoration to holiness and happiness. Their scheme includes a reconciliation of the tenets of Calvinism and Arminianism, by uniting the leading doctrines of both, as far as they are found in the Scriptures, from which union they think the sentiment of universal restoration naturally flows. Thus they reason.—The Arminian proves from Scripture that God is love; that he is good to all; that his tender mercy is over all his works; that he gave his Son for the world; that Christ died for the world,—even for the whole world,and that God will have all men to be saved. The Calvinist proves also from Scripture, that God is without variableness or shadow of turning; that his love, like himself, alters not; that the death of Christ will be efficacious towards all for whom it was intended; that God will perform all his pleasure, and that his counsel shall stand. The union of these Scriptural principles, is the final restoration of all men. Taking the principles of the Calvinists and Arminians separately, we find the Calvinist teaching, or at least inferring, that God *doth not* love *all;* but that he made the greater part of men to be endless monuments of his wrath; the Arminian declaring the love of God to all; but admitting his *final failure* of restoring the greater part. The God of the *former* is great in *power* and *wisdom*, but deficient in *goodness*, and capricious in his conduct. Who that views the character, can sincerely love it? The God of the *latter* is exceeding *good*, but deficient in *power* and *wisdom*,—who can trust such a being? If, therefore, both Calvinists and Arminians love and trust the Deity, it is not under the character which their several systems ascribe to him; but they are constrained to hide the imperfections which their views cast upon him, and boast of a God, whose *highest glory* their several schemes will not admit."

The Author further observes, "The Universalists teach the doctrine of election; but *not* in the exclusive Calvinistic sense of it. They teach that God has chosen some for the good of all;—and that his final purpose towards all, is intimated by his calling his elect the *first* born and the *first fruits* of his creatures; which, say they, implies other branches of his family, and a further ingathering of the harvest of mankind. They suppose the Universal doctrines to be the most consonant to the perfections of the Deity;—most worthy of the character of Christ, as the Mediator;—and that the Scriptures cannot be made consistent with themselves, upon any other plan. They teach, that ardent love to God, peace, meekness, candour, and universal love to men, are the natural result of their views. This doctrine is not new. Origen, a Christian father who lived in the third century, wrote in favour of it. St. Augustine of Hippo, mentions some divines in his day, whom he calls the merciful doctors, who held it. The German Baptists, many of them, even before the reformation, propagated it. The Minnonites in Holland have long held it. In England, about the latter end of the seventeenth century, Dr. Rust, Bishop of Dromore, in Ireland, published *a letter of resolutions concerning Origen, and the chief of his opinions*, in which it has been thought he favoured the Universal doctrine which Origen held. Mr. Jeremiah White wrote in favour of the same sentiments soon afterwards. The Chevalier Ramsay, in his elaborate work of the Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion, espouses it. Archbishop Tillotson supposes future punishment to be of limited duration; as does Dr. Burnet, master of the Charter-House, in his book on the state of the dead. But the writers of late years, who have defended the subject most fully, are Dr. Newton, Bishop of Bristol, Mr. Stonehouse, rector of Islington, Dr. Chauncy, Dr. Hartly, in his profound work on man, Mr. Purvis of Edinburgh,—and many more names I have omitted for the sake of brevity." The Author makes one very remarkable observation, and not more so than true, in his introduction, where he says, "Their scheme includes a reconciliation of the tenets of Calvinism and Arminianism, by uniting the leading doctrines of both, *as far as they are found in the Scriptures.*" In justice, can either of the contending parties ask more? What did the great Apostle to the Gentiles demand of the believers in his day? He said, "Follow me, as I follow Christ." And Universal salvation is inevitably the consequence of the union of the sentiments of Calvinism and Arminianism, so far as they are both *found* in the *Scriptures*. Therefore, the Universalists only hold to the truths which are found existing in each of their systems; and when Calvinists condemn the Universalist sentiment, they condemn at *least* one half of their *own* system. And also the Arminians, when they condemn the same sentiment, they stand in the same predicament with their neighbours, the Calvinists; and their uniting to deny Universal salvation, is nothing more nor less, than *denying all the truth* which exists in their *own* systems!

J. B.

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor,—In the 15th number of the Gospel Herald, you say, "There is now an opportunity for the believers in a conditional salvation to come forward and prove it such." I am, Sir, a plain woman, and write not for the sake of writing, but for the truth. Reason as well as revelation teaches, that our salvation is conditional. Suppose a beggar was to ask you for a piece of bread, and you gave it to him, would he have obtained it, if he had not asked for it? The condition is asking for the bread, but not meriting it. Jesus Christ and his apostles preached a conditional salvation. Mark 1st chap. 14th, 15th verses, Acts 2d chap. 38th verse, 10th chap. 34th, 35th verses, 16th chap. 31st verse, Isaiah 55th chap. 1st verse. If there are no conditions, why are we commanded to believe, and repent.

Mary.

ANSWER.

We respectfully ask the attention of our correspondent, to the following, as an illustration of the subject, and an answer to her question, &c. Suppose a man *rich* beyond conception in all the necessaries and comforts of life, and within the sphere of his knowledge, beings, who are "*poor and blind*, and *naked*," and at the same time so ignorant as to imagine they are *rich*, and can *see*, and are *clothed;* would they ask for that which they are ignorant of standing in need of? And if they become sensible of their *poverty*, and of the *riches* of their neighbour, would they not *ask* of him to *supply* their *need*, if they knew his *inclination* to assist them was *equal* to his *ability?* And would not the *rich* man deserve any thing but a good name, if he, *knowing* their *suffering*, and at the same time their *ignorance* and *blindness*, were to let them *perish* at his door rather than *give unasked* of his abundance? A *good man* would not wait to be asked to feed the hungry, or clothe the naked. And the *beggar*, were he sensible that a man knew his wants, instead of asking, would wait a reasonable time for his assistance, and if he received nothing, might safely calculate there was nothing for *him*. If a man were to tell a beggar, if you will *ask bread* of me, I will *give* you *bread;* the case would be altered. And if he were to add, I will *not give* unless *you ask*, the condition would be plainly stated. Are we to suppose, that God has made *eternal life* conditional, and the *condition* to consist in *asking* God to give us eternal life? The Scriptures, it is true, declare, that if ye ask, ye shall receive; but the Scriptures do *not* declare, that *none shall receive*, but *those* who *ask*. So far from this, God has declared, "*before they call, I will answer*. I am *found* of those that *sought me not*." And God called to the rebellious stiff-necked Israelites, saying, "*Return* unto *me*, for I *have redeemed* thee." Not, *if you will return* unto me, I *will redeem you*. God, like a tender affectionate Father, invites his wandering deluded children to return to him; and as an inducement, informs them of his disposition to receive them. He tells them to *ask*, and assures them that he will *give*. But to infer from this, that he gives *because* they ask, and would *not* give *without* they asked, is highly derogatory to the character of that God, "who is *good to all;* and whose *tender* mercies are over all his works." Our correspondent quotes first, the 1st chap. Mark, 14th 15th, verses. "Now, after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand,—repent ye, and believe the gospel." Repenting is turning. They were asked to repent, or turn, and to believe, &c. consequently, that which they were required to believe was the reverse of that which they were required to *turn from*. It is well known that the Jews believed *none* would be *saved* but *themselves*, and their *nation*. And the gospel of the kingdom of God is, "That *all nations* whom God hath made *shall come* and worship before him." That "Jesus by the grace of God tasted death for *every man;* and is the Saviour of all men." Christ, surely would not have asked the Jews to believe this gospel if it was not true; and if it is true, *all men* are the *saved* of the Lord. Christ did not tell them, if you *will believe*, you shall go to heaven? And if you will *not believe*, you shall go to hell, and be miserable through all eternity. There is none of this *conditional salvation* here!

Our correspondent's next quotation, is the 2d chap. of the Acts of the apostles, 38th verse, and we shall take the liberty to add the next, the 39th verse. "Then Peter said unto them," (unto whom? *Ans.* To those who asked him what they should do? Not, what shall we believe?) "Peter said, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the *promise is unto you*, and to *your children*, and to ALL that *are afar off*, as *many* as the *Lord* our God shall call."* Peter did not say, the *promise* is only *to*, or *for* the *few* that are *chosen!* but, "*to* ALL that are afar off!" How many are afar off? *Ans.* All are afar off, that are not near. And if the *promise* is to as *many* as God shall *call*, and at the same time to *all* that are afar off, it then inevitably follows, that God *calls all* that are *afar off!* Now, we ask, what is the promise? *Ans.* It is "Eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began." Epistle of Paul to Titus, 1st chap. 2d verse. And Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, 9th chap. 15th verse, describes Christ, the Mediator of the New Testament, by death making the promise sure; that "they which are *called* might *receive* the *promise* of *eternal* inheritance." Shall any man presume to say, that God, who promises, will *not perform?* And is it possible for any person, after reading this passage carefully, to say, that the *promise* is made conditional? It is not possible for any man living who understands this passage, to utter so great a falsehood. Christ asked, and "received the heathen his inheritance; and the uttermost parts of the earth his possession."

(To be concluded next week)

* Note. We earnestly entreat our correspondent to observe, that the *promise* is to as *many* as the Lord our *God shall call;* not to as *many*, or *any*, or to *those only*, who *shall call upon him!*

Errata.—In our last, the 17th Number, 65th page, 23d *line* from the *top*, 3d column, for "they lay a wonderful *distress*," read, they lay a wonderful "*stress*." In 67th page, 29th and 30th lines from the *top*, 3d column, read, instead of "Do they not *reject*, as orthodoxical,"—Do they not "*receive* and *reject*," &c.

To Correspondents.

We have received another string of interrogatories, queries, &c. from Philotheus. We think he is bound, either to disprove our premises by direct evidences from the Scriptures, or to admit them to be truth, or to acknowledge that "*his lamp is gone out.*" In our opinion, he has all the inquisitiveness of Socrates, without his judgment or candour. His communication shall be noticed in our next, and if *we* should occasionally *ask* a question, and *quere* a little, we hope Philotheus will pardon us,when he considers,that "*example* is more powerful than precept."—TRANOTIKOS, in answer to the SINCERE INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH, shall meet with due attention. THEOPHILUS, who has embarked in the same cause, shall be *particularly attended* to!

Several communications were received when this paper was preparing for the press. They shall be published without any unnecessary delay.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1820. NO. 19.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Answer to an "Inquirer after Truth."

(Concluded.)

Our correspondent has taken it for granted, that the misconstructions which an unbelieving world have erroneously palmed upon the Scriptures, are taught in the Scriptures; and taking this false data for the ground of his objections, he proceeded to find fault at a round rate, and concluded with the declaration, "Therefore, it is not the work of God." We ask, wherefore? Now, it is imperiously the duty of our correspondent, first, to prove his *premises*, then, his "*therefore*," would come in with a good grace, and not till then! We shall examine these objections, in the order in which our correspondent has arrayed them; and prove, that they have no more bearing on the *question*, than they have on the present dispute in England, between the King and Queen. Relative to our correspondent's remark, of the men who composed the councils at Nice and Laodicea, that, they being weak and wicked, he could not *swallow down* their decisions as the word of God, &c., we not only concur with him, but advise him never to swallow the decisions of any men, however good, as the word of God. God is worthy of credit, independent of the testimony, or countenance of any man, or number of men, whether they are weak or strong, wicked or good. Our correspondent says, "The Old Testament tells us, that God created the heavens and the earth, and every thing therein, in six days. Now, as the *eternal salvation* of *men* is of much greater importance than this creation, and as that salvation depends, as the New Testament tells us, on man's knowledge of, and belief in Jesus Christ, it necessarily follows, from our belief in the goodness and justice of God, and our knowledge of his Almighty power and wisdom, as demonstrated in the creation, *that all this, if true*, would be *made known to all* parts of the *world* in as *little time*, at *least*, as was employed in *making the world*," &c. It is evident, that the *idea* our correspondent meant to convey, is, that the *salvation of man* depends on his *knowledge and belief*, &c., *in this life*. Now, the New Testament tells us no such thing,—we repeat it,—there is no such doctrine taught in the New Testament. And we take our correspondent on his own ground, and we *will prove*, that this knowledge will be made known, not in as "little time," but in *less time*, "than was employed in the creation of inanimate matter." This done, and our correspondent's objections, all of them *en mass*, are *gone!* We believe this must satisfy him,—for if he rejects the Scriptures on account of their injustice and unreasonableness, in not providing a salvation commensurate with the importance which the necessity of the occasion demands, and we prove from those very Scriptures, that those very Scriptures have provided a salvation, &c., our correspondent is bound, as an honest and consistent man, to believe the Scriptures, when he sees that they contain the *very evidence*, which he himself has defined to be necessary, and conclusive. Our correspondent says, *six* days were employed in creating inanimate matter, &c. The Scriptures declare, that mankind died in Adam their earthly head, and died in *a*, or *the*, or *one* day. Isaiah 34th chap. 1st, to 5th verses inclusive, contains a prophecy, relative to the salvation of *all men*, in ONE DAY, and it is *the* day of vengeance. The *earth*,—all *nations* and people,—the *world*, and *all* that come *forth of it, are called upon to hear*,—hear what? *Ans.* that the *indignation* of the Lord is upon *all those* who are *called* upon,—God hath destroyed them ALL,—the WHOLE,—when was this done? *Ans.* when the "*sword* of the Lord was *bathed in heaven*,—when Christ the Lamb was slain on Calvary! This was the *one day* of salvation. The prophet David testified, saying, "Thy people shall be willing in *the day* of thy power." And Isaiah testified, saying, "All thy children shall be taught of God." Again, "The Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and *all* the *ends* of the *earth shall* see the salvation of our God!" Again, "And in this *mountain*,"—what mountain? *Ans.* CALVARY,—"shall the Lord of hosts make unto *all people* a feast of fat things, &c. And he will destroy in this mountain."—Calvary,—"the *face* of the *covering* cast over *all people*, and the *veil* spread over *all nations*. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off all the earth; for the Lord hath spoken *it*. And it *shall be said* in that *day*,"—what day? *Ans. The day* of the salvation of our God, "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord; we have *waited for him*, we will be glad, and rejoice in his salvation." These are not the decisions of weak and wicked men. They are prophetic testimonies, which God communicated by his prophets to the world. Here are no conditions,—no six days spent in saving,—but *a* day of salvation, when *all*,—every one,—shall believe, rejoice and live! All these prophecies pointed to Jesus Christ, whose arm brought salvation, and who declared, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." He was lifted up, drew all unto him, and saved them with an everlasting salvation. This is the truth to be believed. It is worthy of God, good news to man, and worthy the acceptance and gratitude of every intelligent creature. It *therefore* follows, that the *enjoyment* of this salvation *depends* upon man's *believing* it,—the *salvation* itself has *nothing* to do with his *belief*.

Our correspondent expresses an idea, that it would be offering an insult to Deity, to suppose that he would pay a greater regard to inanimate matter, than he would to the salvation of innumerable millions of souls that he had made. Where our correspondent procured this *notion*, we know not; but, we do know, that the very Scriptures he considers as unworthy of God, so far from advocating a doctrine of this kind, contain the reverse,—in fact, all that our correspondent regards as good, is found in the Scriptures, and a great deal more; and he must find another origin for his inconsistencies and absurdities, than the Bible. Our correspondent taking it for granted, we presume, that all he had said was correct, says, "Now observe how the promulgation of this salvation, by a knowledge of, and belief in Jesus Christ, went on, compared with the work of creation. Our correspondent must excuse us for saying, that his view of this subject, however it may add to the character of a Deist in point of wisdom, would be very derogatory to the reputation of any man, who made the least possible pretension to the slightest knowledge of the Scriptures. Now observe! Observe what? Observe the contrast between the saving the soul, and making the world. We believe, that if our correspondent had searched the Scriptures, he would have found, that man was placed at the head of creation, and that inanimate matter, if it received importance from the manner or length of time in its creation, it owes in a great measure all of it to man, for whose use and service it was created. We are not among those, who believe that man was created for the earth. We believe rather, that the earth was created for man. Our correspondent's remark, relative to the time which transpired in generation, &c., and the conclusion which he attempts to *drag* from his premises, is weaker and more puerile than can easily be expressed. It betrays the most astonishing ignorance of the gospel. What in the name of common sense, has the *salvation* of the *soul* to do with the *formation* of the *body*? There is a strange absurdity involved in our correspondent's hypothesis. He complains, first, "That God paid greater regard to the creation of inanimate matter, than to the salvation of the souls of millions,—Second, that it *took forty* times longer to make only ONE of these innumerable millions of souls, a body, than it took to make the world or inanimate matter! If there is not the grossest and most palpable contradiction, both expressed and implied, in these our correspondent's premises and objections, which can be found in the whole creation, we acknowledge ourselves ignorant of the meaning of words altogether. God surely would value his work according to its importance; and we cannot suppose, that the Deity would consider of less value than inanimate matter, that soul, the body, or case to contain which, took forty times as long to make, as it did to make inanimate matter!

Our correspondent observes, "*Thirdly*, Christ, as Luke asserts, was thirty years old before he began his mission; millions of souls died in the mean time, without knowing *it*." We ask, *without knowing what*? Did they not know that Christ had began his mission? Suppose all who died previous to the birth of Christ, had lived at the time Christ began his mission, and believed *that Christ had began his mission*, would this save them? What kind of a mission did Christ begin? And was he able to effect his purpose? These are questions which must be understood, before a person can believe any thing satisfactory about it,—and we think they should likewise be understood by *those*, who would undertake to discredit, or undervalue this *mission*. We appeal, even to our correspondent, whether in his opinion, he would rationally expect to obtain *advice* from a man, relative to any *question* or *science*, with which the *adviser* was himself profoundly ignorant? No! And for a man to undertake to disprove that, of which he knows nothing, is equally absurd and impossible. Christ was himself under the best advantage to know the *object* of his *mission*. And presuming this to be the case, we shall examine his account of the matter, and the reader can judge for himself, of its *nature*, and the probability of its effecting any thing. And we observe, that we have no authority for believing that a part, or any thing short of the whole for which he came being accomplished,—we must believe he *did* accomplish the object of his mission, or he did not,—there is no half doing the work. Christ declared, "I came, not to judge, but to *save the world!*" Did he come in vain? If the *world* is not *saved* he did!—for he did not come to *save* a *part*, but the *whole*, and if he failed in accomplishing his purpose, ALL IS LOST! Salvation is a term rendered *obsolete* for ever! And damnation, destruction and misery, alone compose, and occupy our *vocabulary*. Mankind are saved, or they are not saved;—if *saved*, all the powers of earth and hell cannot trouble their eternal peace,—if not saved,—all the preaching and prating, and groaning, and whining, of all the Hypocrites, Pharisees, and Devotees, in creation, would not save *one* soul! What! Did Christ attempt to *save*, and fail? And shall you, ye impotent and ignorant, ye vile and abominable,—will you attempt the attaining an object, which the Son of the living God could not procure? Your *ignorance* or *vanity*, or both united, is insufferable; you deserve to be held up to the whole world in derision, and your principles to the scorn and contempt of all the sober, honest and rational part of creation! What, we again ask, was the *mission* of Christ? And does the knowledge, that Christ *came on a mission* SAVE the world, or any man, or any number of men? Is this the way of salvation? Was a man drowning in the middle

of the Hudson, and were he informed by a person at a distance, that his neighbour was coming in a boat to his relief, would this knowledge save him from drowning? Or would his neighbour *save* him? If the man's faith or belief, that his neighbour would save him, would prevent his drowning, and assist him to the shore, his neighbour might go about his business, and take no trouble about the man. Again, are mankind *saved* by *dying* a temporal death, or are they saved by being preserved from temporal death? What has the death of the body to do with the salvation of the soul? Surely nothing. All mankind die a temporal death. Christ died, not to *save* the *body* from *death*, but to reunite the soul to God its Father, and restore that *image*, which was lost by transgression. It is Christ, the Head, united to mankind universally, the members, who effects this salvation; and whether these *souls* are joined to, and in a mortal body, or out of this body, can neither *help*, nor *hinder*. Christ is the Saviour! Mankind are created anew in Christ; and if their belief, or unbelief, their knowledge or ignorance of this fact, effected their salvation in the least possible manner, it could not be said, Christ was the only Saviour; neither could it be said, that "The blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin," if *one* sin remained, which could any way prevent or destroy the salvation of *one* soul! Therefore, all mankind might die ignorant of salvation, agreeably to the apostle's declaration, "For we *must all* be *changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,—for this *corruption must* (not may, or can, or might,) put on *incorruption*; and this *mortal*, *immortality*; and then, (when? *Ans.* At the resurrection morning) shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, O! Death, where is thy sting? O! Grave, where is thy victory? The *sting* of death is *sin*,—and the strength of *sin* is the *law*, but, (but what? mark well what follows) thanks be to God, who GIVETH *us* the VICTORY, *through* JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD!" Yes, we repeat it, mankind might all be ignorant of this glorious truth, in this life, and it could not effect their future welfare, for it is God, who giveth us the victory, through Christ our Lord." Not our *faith*, or *works*, or both united.

Our correspondent's *fourth* declaration, would, we think, have been entitled to more credit, were it based on better evidence than his single affirmation; and the inferences which he would deduce from it, would not lose any thing in their weight or importance, if he could prove from nature, reason, or revelation, that the salvation of mankind depended on the *book* called the New Testament being compiled, &c. If this was the *fact*, it would be the *compiler* and book-binder who would *save* the world! And we doubt, whether our correspondent, with *all his faith*, would be willing to admit this as truth.

Our correspondent's *fifth*, and last declaration, is certainly a very conclusive argument, but fortunately, it is against himself. We say, fortunately, for we think the sooner he is divested of his errors the better; and it *must* be a gratification to him, to know, that he is not altogether indebted to others for this favour, but contributed in a great measure toward it himself. It was, says our correspondent, "about a thousand years after that, (three hundred years after the apostles,) before it could be circulated; because, neither Jesus, nor his apostles, had knowledge of, or were inspired with the art of printing; and consequently, as the means for making it universally known, did not exist, the means were not equal to the end; and *therefore, it is not the work of God!*" We ask our correspondent, where he obtained the knowledge of the fact, that Jesus had no knowledge of the art of printing? Did the knowledge of the *art* of printing come by inspiration from God? This is strange language for a Deist. Is it more difficult to print a book, than to restore sight to the blind, feet to the lame, and to give life to the dead? Could not he, who commanded the storm to cease, and was obeyed; could not he print a book, or conceive and plan the means by which it could be done? Was he ignorant of the future, he who foretold the destruction of Jerusalem in the most minute respects, was he inferior to the man who first printed a book? The *end* which our correspondent speaks of, he has explained to be the *salvation of mankind;* which he says, the New Testament tells us, depends on man's *knowledge* of, and *belief* in Jesus, according to our correspondent's hypothesis *in this life*, &c. This is the *end*, the *means* to *accomplish* this *end*, he declares, is the compiling, publishing, or printing and distributing the Scriptures,—and as this *mean* was not universal, the *effect* could not be universal, &c. Our correspondent, we presume, believes that *nature* teaches man, and that nature is sufficient. Now, it is evident, that the *cause*, however universal it may be, does not produce an *universal effect;* for it would be absurd, to say, that one *cause* will produce effects, varied in their kind to that degree, as almost to exceed the powers of reason to enumerate, arrange, class, and define them. Does nature teach one nation that the sun is the Deity? Another, that a log of wood is the Supreme Being? And a third, that a quantity of gold and silver made in the shape of a man, or some other animal, is the Governor of the universe? Is one nation taught, that there are two God's or great Rulers of all things, one *good*, and the other *bad*, and that they must court the favour of the good, and deprecate the anger of the *bad?* And another taught, that an *ox* is the Maker and upholder of all things? Is it not evident, that *nature* is very unequal to the *end?* and therefore, that *nature* cannot be the work of God, nor the *means* which is absolutely necessary to procure the *end*, and of consequence not the *source* from which man *is*, or *can* be instructed? Will our correspondent presume to deny the deductions which proceed from, and flow from his *own* premises? And if he *denies* that *nature* can *inform* man, and we believe he must do this to preserve the least possible appearance of consistency, and likewise *deny* that the *Scriptures* can *inform* man,—we ask him, where then can man get information? It is *conceded* that information is necessary, and more than conceded; and there never was a Deist who ever pretended that man was *possessed*, or in any manner gifted with *intuition*,—where we again ask, is information to come from? Is there any man now in possession of information? If so, where did he obtain it? Ransack and examine ancient history, and one fact is evident, *nature* never taught man his destination, or origin. This cannot be controverted. The *Scriptures*, according to our correspondent, cannot,—and his evidence of this, his *assumed* fact, *proves*, that *nature* cannot,—and no man in possession of his senses ever would suppose even for a moment, that man had a power or faculty of intuition,—it then inevitably follows, if these premises are all true, that *man knows nothing!* Infidelity, or Deism, therefore, leads directly and inevitably to downright Atheism! And Atheism, to a *denial of consciousness*, *life*, *certainty*, *substance*, and even the existence of *matter* itself,—and *sweeps* with the *besom* of annihilation the UNIVERSE TO NOTHING!!! Is it possible that rational beings will give ear for a moment to such abominable principles? Is there no distinction existing between *man*, and the *stones* under his feet? Can our correspondent *look* at his principles and their deductions, without HORROR! This accursed antiphilological delusion, if heeded, would blast every social feeling, and bury creation in the grave of the blackest, the most tremendous despair.

We hope our correspondent will see the deductions which *must*, not may flow from these premises, and acknowledge that the premises are wrong. We think it probable, that he would not have introduced these premises as founded upon the Scriptures, had he been conversant with the Scriptures, and taken counsel of them, instead of the absurd misconstructions which men have put upon them. Were the common orthodox doctrine of saving faith in the creature true, ninety-nine out of an hundred of all the race of Adam, would be damned with endless misery. And our correspondent has made this error, the foundation of all his objections to the Scriptures; and if the first is true, his objections are in order and substantiated; but the doctrine of the *faith* of the *creature* being *essential* to *his* Salvation in *this life*, is a delusion of the devil, and no where to be found in the Scriptures of God. God has *revealed* to man by his prophets, and by his Son Jesus Christ, and his apostles, a knowledge of his purposes of grace to fallen man; and this revelation, if believed in this life, gives a foretaste of the joys which proceed from the knowledge of the Salvation of God. God has communicated to men the knowledge, that he is their Father, and that they shall come and worship before him. And there are those, who from spiritual pride, and unbelief in the goodness of God, deny these truths; and, contend, that God only loves a *part* of mankind, and will *save* only a *part;* and the remainder are either decreed to endless misery, or that God will make them miserable on account of their sins, and *save* those, who are no better, except in their own estimation.

The numerous calls of our correspondents, obliges us to close our remarks abruptly. The Sincere Inquirer after Truth is requested, not to apply our remarks on the general, corrupt, and abominable tendency of Deism to his own person. It is not the *man*,—but the *principle*, that we *war* against. For *we know*, that our correspondent is a member with us of the body of Christ,—*we know*, that he will bow the knee to Jesus, and acknowledge him for *his Lord*, to the glory of God our Father, to whom be ascribed dominion and power, for ever!

AMEN.

Answer to Mary.

(Concluded.)

Our Correspondent next directs us, to the 10th chap. of the Acts, 34th and 35th verses. "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." This chap. explains the declaration of Peter. God communicated to Peter a vision of a great sheet knit at the four corners, that nothing contained should fall out, which sheet was represented as containing "all manner of four footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air." Peter was a Jew, and supposed that the Jews alone were accepted of God; and this vision of the sheet was intended to correct his error. For Peter was *wrong!* He was completely ignorant of God's design towards a fallen world. And it appears, from the context, that Peter had not even then a clear view of the purpose of God, according to our correspondent's understanding of his declaration to Cornelius,—the sheet was let down from heaven, and contained, according to the law of Moses, unclean beasts and reptiles; and Peter himself pronounced them unclean, and was told by God that he had cleansed them, not that they had cleansed themselves; not that they had fulfilled certain conditions! And these *unclean things* were *unconditionally* received into heaven. Unclean to the eye of Peter, but accepted of God for Christ's sake. "The blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin." Now, if Peter really told Cornelius, that God *only* accepted those who performed certain *conditions*, which *conditions* were their righteous works, we think he received but little instruction from his vision. Peter, declares, in the 43d verse, "Whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Surely Peter would not contradict himself in the same chapter. And we never supposed that any man ever did, or ever will have remission of his sins, EXCEPT he BELIEVETH *in* Jesus Christ. It is impossible to be otherwise. Now, where is the condition? The condition of salvation, is nothing *more*, nor *less*, than, to use the words of the prophet, "to take the cup of salvation," for it is freely offered, "without money, and without price." If there was a *price* affixed, it would be *conditional*, but not without. Our attention is next directed to the 16th chap. 31st verse. "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." This was the answer of Paul and Silas, to the keeper of the prison, who asked them, saying, "Sirs, what must I DO to be saved." Mark well the *question*, and the answer. "What must I do? Now we ask,—did Paul and Silas tell him to do any thing? No, they did not! they told

him to believe the *work* was *done!* For it would be a gross absurdity, to suppose that his *believing* that Christ was his Saviour, could make him so—if this were the case, the man would save himself! The man was already saved, by the blood of Christ, who "was delivered for his offences"—and the man was already justified, by the resurrection of Christ, for "he rose for his justification"—and the man was told to *believe* the *truth*, for if Christ was not his Saviour before he believed it, he was called upon to *believe* a LIE! But the man was *saved*, and did not know it, and when he believed it, he likewise believed that his family were also saved. Paul and Silas told him, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and *thou* shalt be *saved*, and thy *house*." What kind of doctrine is this? Will my believing save my children? No! but if I believe the Lord Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the world, of all men—I know that my house is saved! The next and last passage, which our correspondent directs our attention to, fills us with wonder and astonishment too big for utterance.—Reader, it is the 55th chap. of Isaiah, and the 1st verse. "HO!—Every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters,—and *he* that hath NO MONEY!!!—come ye,—buy and eat,—yea, come, buy wine and milk, *without money* and without *price!*" Would to heaven we could find words to express half our astonishment,—What!—they who *have no money*, they perform conditions? it must be the blackness and darkness of unbelief, which can charge God with *deception* here. We entreat our correspondent to *read* with the utmost,—with the greatest possible attention, this chap. of Salvation; and may God, who alone can save, enlighten her understanding, and convince her, that "He is in Christ reconciling the WORLD unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." And that all who believe this *truth*, are justified from all things; "for there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we can be saved, but the name of JESUS!

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Gospel Herald.

ANSWER TO THE SINCERE INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

I am pleased when I discover a sincere inquirer after *truth*. What is truth? Though there are many truths, natural and spiritual, yet that which is emphatically called truth, is God. Where is saving truth, or where is God to be found? *Ans.* Within, and not without us. For the Lord is light, and he "enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world." He is not the sun of the natural world, which natural men, such as the Incas and the ancients worshipped, but he is the Spiritual Sun, that is said by John to "enlighten every man that cometh into the world" This *light* he says, is the *word* of God, which Paul declares, to be *nigh*, in the heart," and not afar off, and preached in, or to every creature; and, says he, "have they not heard? Yes, verily."

This Sincere Inquirer after that truth, which is God, (the greatest good,) is, therefore, advised, to turn his attention inwardly, to this light in his own conscience, which may be seen, illuminating and showing men their dark and wicked hearts before purification, when their minds are by grace, turned from temporary and worldly things, to eternal and heavenly considerations This light, is not only called the *word*, but *witness* of God. "If we believe the *witness* of *men*, the witness of *God* is greater." Holy men, had, and have this witness, which is sometimes called "The candle or lamp of the Lord." This candle in the wicked, is said to be often extinguished or hid, consequently, it is often relighted or renewed. If the inquirers after God and truth, would know, and "acquaint themselves with God, and be at peace" in him, they must believe and obey the light, and walk in it, that they may be regenerated by the power of the light, and become the children of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ, the sent of God. This light says John, is Christ the Lord, who assumed flesh, and he is the only Saviour: and Jehovah has said, there is no other Saviour besides me. Immanuel is God within his saints; and, therefore, John said to such, "Greater is he (God) that is in you, than he (Satan) that is in the world." For, says John, "We know that we are of God," and the whole world lieth in wickedness. John knew that he was of God, for he had the *witness*, or Immanuel, within, testifying it. He that rules the world, or children of disobedience, is Satan. As Christ within, is said to be "the hope of glory," and as we are commanded to believe and walk in the light, (that is to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and keep his commandments spoken by his Spirit to the churches;) so it is evident that Jesus Christ is the light, grace and power of God, is the way, the truth and the life, and how no man can come unto the Father, but by his Son, the light of Salvation. Every inquirer, who desires to know the truth of these things, and of the Scriptures written by the inspiration of truth, should first seek, wait for, unite with, and experience the saving operation of this power, wisdom and goodness of God, to be found within themselves, and they should also peruse Wm. Lewis's address to the clergy, Barclay's apology for the true Christian Divinity, life of Jane Gordon, and especially, that excellent work of Governor William Penn, called the Christian Quaker.

This short answer, obviates the objections of the Inquirer after Truth; and I hope it will be more satisfactory, than the Editor's outward manner of proving the truth of the Scriptures, and the Divinity of Jesus Christ.* Thus we see, that whatsoever is known of God, is manifested within. The Inquirer pertinently observes, "That as he salvation of men, is of much greater importance than this creation, and as salvation depends, as the New Testament tells us, on man's knowledge of the Almighty's power and wisdom; all this, if true, would be made known to all parts of the world, in as little time, at least, as was employed in making the world." I verily think so too. As the light shines, and always has shone, (unless hid behind the clouds of our sins,) his observations with regard to the flesh, which the light once assumed at the end of an outward and typical dispensation, is irrelevant to the *real light;* though relevant to the *type* of it, which is the *flesh* made under the outward covenant, which came to end a shadowy dispensation and its sins, and to turn from it to the *light* of God, called by Isaiah, the *new covenant*, which is in every man's conscience. This is the seed of the kingdom, the seed Christ, the Day Star, or the Sun of Righteousness that will arise in the hearts of those, who open the door of their affections to its regenerating power, and are passive under its influence.

THEOPHILUS.

P. S. The Sincere Inquirer after Truth, is in a much better condition, than the proud hypocrite, boasting Pharisee, or persecuting bigot; and I have no doubt, if he seeks the truth humbly, patiently, and perseveringly, he will find it satisfactorily, and in the proper time before he goes hence, to be seen of men no more. I wish to encourage him to seek the Lord where he may be found, and where he manifests himself; for a portion of his Spirit is given to every man to profit him, to teach, counsel, guide, command, save and defend. No Bible, creed, or church, should be so trusted, believed, or depended upon. As every good thought and desire is from the Holy Spirit of God, every evil thought and desire is from an opposing spirit, called Satan; therefore, if we adhere to and obey the good, and depart from the evil, I doubt not we shall find the Scriptures to be true in our own experience, which is a thousand times better, than all the testimonies of holy men or their books. But the outward witness of these, strengthens the testimony of the Spirit.

REMARKS.

It would appear from reading the above, that the Sincere Inquirer after Truth was "*up for a market*" And, Theophilus, it appears, is very eager for the purchase. For ourselves, instead of baiting him with a *contrast;* and giving him the preference to others, we candidly tell him, as the ghosts were told, who presented themselves to be ferried across the River Styx, that, unless he *strips to the buff*, not only of all the *rubbish* which he *formerly* had, but every thing of the *kind* which he has *received* from Theophilus, by *way* of *payment* to induce him to *join* his *party*," our *boat*" will not accommodate him. "Filthy rags," would sink him in a moment. Wm. Lewis's address, Barclay's apology, the life of Jane Gordon, and Governor Penn's *works*," would take up as much room as half a dozen Bibles, and being useless for ballast, on account of their lightness, they would of necessity be thrown overboard. Theophilus advises the Inquirer after Truth, to look *in* upon *himself*, for he has got the light in himself, &c. "Holy men had, and have this *witness*, which is sometimes called the candle or lamp of the Lord. This *candle* in the wicked is said to be often extinguished, &c." Our correspondent likewise says, that this light is God, Christ, Immanuel, the Saviour, and, strange to tell, God, or Christ, is in every man! If our correspondent had produced something better for proof, than his own declaration, we think he would have stood a better chance of catching his proselyte. Theophilus says, he that rules the world, or children of disobedience, is Satan. We wonder if Theophilus would acknowledge, that God and the devil are in the same persons? Theophilus says, "As Christ within is said to be the hope of glory," &c. We should like to know who made this declaration. Theophilus says, "Jesus Christ is the *way*, the *truth* and the life." And that "No man can come unto the Father but by his Son." After reading this, we were a little surprised, so soon to find Theophilus advising a *different way*. What! is God truth, the Scriptures truth, and Christ the only way, &c., and under these circumstances advise a man, *first*, to seek within himself,—*second*, peruse Lewis, Barclay, Gordon, and Penn, &c. Is a man's ownself, and Lewis, Barclay, &c., the way? Or is Christ the way? The apostle advises, "him that lacketh wisdom to ask of God?" &c. Theophilus in his P. S. says, "I wish to encourage him to seek the Lord where he may be found, and where he manifests himself." We ask, where is that? Is it in the corrupt heart of the sinner? In that heart, which the Scriptures declare, "Is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked? Is it in the works of Barclay, Lewis, Gordon and Penn? Or is it in the Scriptures, which the apostle declares, "Are able to make us wise unto salvation? Is it not passing strange, that Theophilus, should acknowledge, that "No man can come unto the Father but by his Son" Jesus Christ, and immediately tell of a number of *other ways?* Theophilus says, "This short answer obviates the objections of the Inquirer after Truth; and I hope it will be more satisfactory than the Editor's outward manner of proving the truth of the Scriptures, and the Divinity of Jesus Christ" And adds, "Thus we see, that whatsoever is known of God, is manifested within." And we add, thus we see, that if this is all that is taught within, it is very little; and that very little, very incorrect, and very inconsistent. Theophilus, we must confess, possesses one advantage, to which we lay no claims in this controversy. He is much the same with the Deist in sentiment; and has much less to contend with to make *his system* harmonize. He, and the Deist, already think alike in more than one respect; but we are rather suspicious, that the Deist will not very readily allow all Theophilus's claims; and will of the two, give heed to the Scriptures, when he sees their consistency, instead of believing a *revelation*, which, according to Theophilus, is revealed to every man, and not one out of a thousand of all mankind, that have ever known any thing about it; and even of those, who pretend to know the most, they cannot talk, or write, five minutes, without contradicting themselves.

To conclude. We ask Theophilus, where he obtained his authority for calling Christ, the flesh; and describing him as made under the outward covenant, to end a shadowy dispensation? And to describe the new covenant, which Isaiah speaks of, to be

* Quere. Would not Theophilus have been a little more candid, had he waited and seen our answer before he judged? He had not seen one half of our answer; and that part relating to the Divinity of Christ, was not published when we received Theophilus's communication He had seen the 17th Number only; it is the 18th, which contains our remarks on the Divinity of Christ, and was not then printed!!!

nothing more than a light in every man's conscience; and to declare, that this is the seed of the kingdom, and that this seed is Christ? &c.

We think the public have a right to expect *proof* of these *bold* declarations; and we assure our readers, that with the exception of Barclay's apology, or some modern effusion of the kind, which has emerged from the disturbed imagination of some visionary, no book can be found, which will countenance such impious, absurd, and ridiculous premises and conclusions!

For the Gospel Herald.

Being a reader of the Gospel Herald, I think it may be proper to present the subsequent interrogations, that certain *impediments* to my belief in the Editor's doctrine of the "salvation of all men, especially of those who believe,"* may be removed. For unless such interrogations are satisfactorily illucidated, and the objections removed, I and many others cannot believe in the doctrine that Jesus Christ saved all men about 1800 years ago, so completely, that a second salvation, by a birth of Jesus Christ in every individual is unnecessary.—For I read,—"ye must be born *again*," be born of the Spirit; be begotten of the word, Logos:—be created *anew* in Christ Jesus:—be baptised with the washing of *regeneration*, &c.

The Editor pleads, that none are saints, by quoting certain texts, which assert that the whole world is wicked, and that none is good: no, not one, &c. I grant this;—as to the world:—but Christ Jesus told his disciples, that they were not of the world, or the world would love them; but because they were not of the world, the world would persecute them, &c.—And I accordingly, believe, that there is as much difference between the sons of men, and the sons of God, (see Gen. VI. 2) as between the children of light and the children of darkness; between the good and bad;—the saint and sinner, as there is between *white* and *black*.

The 1st interrogatory, therefore, is, "If all men are saved, because they were saved 1800 years ago, lacking about 15 years, and Jesus came to save men *from*, and not *in* their sins, as the Editor has remarked,—why are not all now righteous, good and holy?—yet the Editor contradicts this idea of holiness. How could we be baptised, crucified, dead, born again, and raised with Jesus Christ, before we existed? yet this appears the Editor's credence: and if so, they, baptism, the cross, new birth, &c. need no repetition.

2d.—In Mat. V. 48—1 Pet. 1. 15, and Lev. XI. 44, 45, God commanded, be holy, be perfect, as he was holy and perfect.—Did God command possibilities or impossibilities?—If the latter, was he not unjust and tyrannical?—and might we not justly accuse him of expecting to reap where he has not sown, or to gather where he has not strewed?—See the parable of the talents. But if he, when he gives a talent and command, affords ability to obey; and Paul said, "God assisting him, he could do all things,"—that is, I suppose, all things God commanded him by his Spirit to execute; not that he could do any thing, and every thing, temporal and spiritual, good and bad:—for who could believe Paul could be such a good and bad being? then it follows, that we can do whatsoever God commands us to do, by the immediate voice of his Spirit. Is this power of obedience effectual in this state, or only in a future disembodied state of the soul?

3d.—"Obedience is said to be better than sacrifice; Sam. 15, 22: Obey the gospel, or expect the wrath of God, Rom. 1, 19, Eph. v, 6: "Trust in the Lord and do good," Psalm 37, 3, and the 18th chap. of Ezekiel, proves the necessity of righteous works in God. Does *fruits* of the Spirit mean *works* of the Spirit?—Why does St. James say, "As the *body* without the soul, or spirit, is dead; so *faith* without works, is dead also?"—I quote from memory.

4th.—If man was made a free-agent, if since his fall, he is restored to free-agency, how, and by what power or grace is he restored to it?—Is it by the immediate gift, power, and grace of the Spirit of God? and is not this the talent, talents, gospel, word, &c.

5th.—If Jesus Christ completely saved all men with an everlasting salvation about 1800 years ago, and the new birth was *then* in Christ, and need not be after the first one of the flesh; (for thus, I understand the Editor, in one of his arguments against Philotheus;) then it follows, that all without condition are saved from their sins; and that death is the door to immortal, immediate, and *aionion* felicity.—In such a case, if all, or if any man fully believed this doctrine,—I ask, what would prevent him, or them, from stealing, robbing, or murdering, to promote his, or their pleasures, increase his, or their riches, or advance his, or their glory?—To murder, would be good to the murdered, by sending them from this bad world to happiness. And the murderer might say—when my crimes bring me into trouble and misery, I will "my quietus make," and enter heaven by self-murder.—No murderer hath eternal life "abiding in him." He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." I was surprised and wondered, to see the Editor controvert this, and try to prove John a blasphemer, that gave the *lie direct* to the Holy Spirit:—because "John also declared, that the Holy Spirit hath testified, that "*we have eternal life in his Son*;" page 59. Has not the murderer eternal life?" says the Editor, "and is it not blaspheming the Holy Spirit to deny this?"—I think not:—because when it is said—"we have eternal life in his Son," it is the reverse of saying we are without eternal life,—if not in his Son; but *we*, here properly refers to those, not of the world, agreeably to chap. V. 19.—*We* know that *we* are of God: and the *whole world* lieth in wickedness." Those who are of God, are not of the world, or the world would love its own, and not persecute the birth of the Spirit of God. In p. 62. the Editor says, "there is no medium between good and evil." If so, a man is good or evil, since "there is no neutrality." If all are saved, all are good. All are not good: ergo, all are not saved.—Hoc est argumentum ad hominem. All are not saved, because all are born a second time without sin to salvation. The first birth is in sin.

6th.—Jesus Christ says, "If ye die in your sins, where I am *ye* cannot come." *If we die in our sins* implies, evidently, we may die sinners and *in our sins;* and that such cannot go to Christ, heaven and happines. *If* implies condition:—so that a man, as a free agent, may be born of God and not commit sin, 1. John, 3 9. or he may commit sin and be not a child of God, but of the devil. "Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God;" V. 10.—If not of God;—this proves that "*the head of every man is Christ*," means Christ is the head of every good man, and that he is the head only of his body the *Church*, which is defined to be the "pillar and ground of truth."—Some men and women are of the Synagogue of Satan; is Christ the head of these unholy deceivers and liars? No.—Rellyans, therefore, wrest the meaning of the Scriptures to suit their carnal conceptions.—They suppose all are in Christ:—when none but the Holy are in this Holy Head. The unholy are in the unholy Spirit, Old Adam, Antichrist, or Satan.

As Miletum has written the conditions of salvation, I wait to see them, and merely remark, that conditions seem attached to the side of man, when rendered by grace a free agent, *id est*, "Do and live." Phil. 2d and 12th, Mark XVI. 16th. But *grace* is *wholly* of *mercy*, and is attached *wholly* to *God!* and appears altogether unconditional as to the volition of God in granting grace—though conditional as to the creature's receiving, and using the grace or talents given.* The 18th chap. of Ezekiel, proves conditions, and the necessity of good works and fruits. "The tree is known by its fruit." The fruits of God's Spirit, Ephes. 5th chap. and 22d verse. As to the creature that is through grace a free agent, I find conditions all through the Scriptures of Holy Inspiration. And I, therefore, suppose, the Editor must have reference, only to the first part of Salvation, and to God, who is under no condition, as to giving his grace, talent or talents. And who giveth to every one as he will. Wishing regeneration, as well as grace to all, I mean, the second, as well as the first part of salvation, I desire the Editor not to be displeased with the interrogations of PHILOTHEUS.

REMARKS.

We ask, what *illucidation* does Philotheus expect, or what has he a right to demand, more than he has already received? Philotheus refuses to believe the oath of Jehovah, who has sworn by himself, that in Christ all the families of the earth shall be blessed. This is not the Editor's doctrine,—it is the doctrine of God! And Philotheus is at issue with his Maker. His interrogatories must be answered, or he will not believe. Are these interrogatories the will of God or man? Are they contained in the Scriptures, or were they generated in the head of the unbeliever? Philotheus "cannot believe that Jesus Christ *saved all* men 1800 years ago, so completely, that a *second* salvation by a *birth* of Jesus Christ *in every* individual is unnecessary. For I read, "Ye must be born *again*," be born of the Spirit; be begotten of the word—Logos, be created anew IN CHRIST JESUS, &c. Reader, Philotheus cannot believe that Christ has saved all men,—why?—because a *second* salvation by a birth of Jesus Christ *in every individual* is necessary; and to prove this, he says, *he* reads, "Ye must be *created* anew *in Christ*, &c! Is it possible that Philotheus is so *stupid*, that he cannot see any *difference* between Christ's being *born* or *created* anew *in us*, and our being *created* anew *in him?* Is Philotheus blind to the *fact*, that the declaration "*created anew in Christ*," proves that mankind were *in* him *before*, at a period anterior to this time, this *second creation in* him? And is it not certain, that they lost their image of God, and that this new creation in Christ, who is the "head of every man," restores every man! In answer to the *note* referred to in Philotheus' first paragraph, we observe, that what to Philotheus appears to be the *new birth*, &c. is, in fact, nothing more than a man's coming to the knowledge of the truth, that he is "created anew *in* Christ Jesus." And a man who supposes that the *holy desires*, or any thing which he possesses, is an evidence of *his* being *born* again, or created anew, to the exclusion of *one* of the human race, is *created a Pharisee!* And we believe, the *devil*, and not *Christ*, is *born* in him.

Philotheus, in his second paragraph, says, that the *world is wicked*, &c. and proceeds to *discriminate*, &c. and we join him, and believe, there is as much difference, as between *white* and *black* comparatively speaking, for those of the world are going about to establish *their own righteousness*,—and those who *have come* to the *light*, trust in the *righteousness* of God. And they believe with Paul, that the "righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. Even the righteousness of God *by faith of Jesus Christ* UNTO ALL, and *upon* all that *believe*,"—why? "for there is no difference." Why? "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Quere. Does not Philotheus believe, that some of his *white* Christians have *not* come short? Philotheus is informed, that when Christ came to *save* the *world*, that there were none of his *white sons* to be found; they were all *black!* And we think it more than probable,

* 1. *Of all men*, by what God does wholly *without man's co-operation*, 2d, "especially of those that believe," and work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, *co-operating with God*, who worketh in them to will and do.—This last, if it is the new birth, is so essential, that without it, no salvation from sin can be expected. The Editor seems to lose sight of all but the first part of salvation. If I at any time mistake him, he must correct me.

* Who that reads the above, and is in possession of one half of his mental faculties, can be deceived by so absurd and ridiculous a conclusion, drawn entire from the head of Philotheus. What! An *unconditional* salvation *conditional?* Is it possible to conceive of a condition, covenant, or agreement, binding on one party only? It is time to be done with this Hopkinsian Logic,—that the *cause* of a *thing* —and that which *occasions* the *thing* is different. Such reasoning, or rather *tormenting common* sense, might pass current for aught we know, among the Hottentots, but it will not do in New-York.

that many of our modern *white* folks, if they could look with an unprejudiced eye into the Scriptures, would find, that they are as *black* as their *black* neighbours! Quere. Suppose Philotheus were to compare his first and second paragraph together; and compare both with the declarations of Christ, that he came to *save the world*,—the *black* world! And with Paul, that God *loved* the *world*, the *black* world!

Philotheus commences his third paragraph, by interrogating, "If all men *are* saved, because they *were* saved 1800 years ago, lacking about 15 years, and Jesus came to save men *from*, and not *in* their sins, as the Editor has remarked,---why are not all now *righteous*, *good* and *holy*? yet the Editor contradicts this idea of holiness." Should Philotheus ever send another communication for this paper, he *must*, to satisfy the Editor, and our readers, at least nine out of ten of them, answer the following question, without any evasion, How can the declarations of Christ and his apostle be truth,---*namely*, of Christ, that "he came to do the will of the Father, to save the world,"---(not the *white sons*,) and further declared, "I have finished the work thou gavest me to do."—How can these declarations be truth, except the world was saved by Christ when he came 1800 years ago, &c? And the apostle, see Colossians, 2d chap. 8th to the 13th verses inclusive—"BEWARE, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and *vain deceit*, after the *tradition* of *men*, after the *rudiments* of the *world*, and *not* after *Christ*. For *in him* dwelleth all the *fulness* of the Godhead bodily. And *ye are complete in him*, which is the head of all principality and power:—*in whom* also *ye are* circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in *putting off* the *sins* of the *flesh*, by the circumcision *of* Christ: Buried *with him* in baptism, *wherein also* YE ARE RISEN WITH HIM, through the faith of the operation of God, who *hath raised him* from the *dead*. And *you*," (who, we ask, did Paul mean? was it the *white sons*? and if so, were they not made *white* 1800 years ago?)" being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of *your flesh*, HATH *he quickened* together *with* him," (with whom, we ask? with Christ, and when was Christ quickened? was it not 1800 years ago?) "having" (in the past tense) "forgiven you all trespasses!" If man was not *circumcised*, *baptized*, *buried*, *quickened* and raised, in, and *with* Christ, 1800 years ago, there is no meaning in language,—and Paul cautions us, to *beware*, of what to us appears to be the doctrine of Philotheus; for Philotheus *denies* Paul *in toto!* And Paul tells us what we *must believe*, and there can only be truth and error, and whatever is contrary to the truth which Paul spoke, is "*vain deceit*, &c." Philotheus has, in our opinion, evaded the truth long enough. In our 10th and 11th Numbers, we explained and answered his interrogatories, and he persists in denying our premises, without producing ONE testimony from the Scriptures to support him. Our *duty* to our *subscribers*, and to the *cause* of truth, *will* not *permit us* patiently to see the Scriptures *trifled* with *any longer!* If Philotheus *believed* the Scriptures to be a revelation from God, we think we have given him sufficient evidence from them to *convince* him, if there is any such thing. We, therefore, expect him, either to acknowledge that he believes the Scriptures to be truth, and entitled to credit, or to confess his *infidelity*, *down* with *his false colours*,—and prove to the world, that he is an *honest* and courageous man! Let Philotheus stand up like a man, and answer our *questions*. How could we have sinned and fallen in Adam, and all this before we existed? Philotheus asks, how could we be baptized, crucified, dead, born again, and raised with Jesus Christ, before we existed? Yet this appears to be the Editor's credence. *And if so*,—adds Philotheus,---the *baptism*, the *cross*, *new birth*, &c. need no repetition." We *demand* of *him*, are they *not* so? Answer us. Equivocate no longer? Either acknowledge your *belief*, your *ignorance*, or your *infidelity!*

Philotheus in his fourth paragraph, introduces a 2d *quere*, and refers us to three passages, &c. We ask Philotheus, whether God, who is a holy being, would command his creatures to be unholy? We ask Philotheus, if the 5th chap. Matthew, from which his quotation is made, will justify him in *judging* mankind, a part of them, to be *black*, and sinners, who are *less* holy than *himself*? And whether he thinks perfection consists in making distinctions and invidious comparisons?—We recommend to Philotheus, to read with attention, the whole, or at least, the last six verses of this chapter. In answer to the question,—"Did God command impossibilities?" We answer, No!---We are commanded to believe *in* Christ. To believe we *are in* Christ *reconciled* unto God. And, that "Christ of God, is made unto us *wisdom*, *righteousness*, *sanctification* and *redemption*." And we are further commanded when *we glory*, to glory *in* the *Lord!* Christ is *our* righteousness; and the righteousness of Christ is *holy!* Relative to "Paul's being a *good* and *bad* being, &c." Paul said *he* was the *chief* of *sinners*. And Christ said, "There is *none* good but *one*, and that is God!" In answer to the last interrogatory in this fourth paragraph, we observe,---that the *obedience* of Christ, which he in our stead rendered to the law of God, *is ours*, here, and hereafter.

Philotheus' fifth paragraph commences with the following quotation,—"Obedience is said to be better than sacrifice." We ask Philotheus if he believes this to be truth? And if he does, whether it would *not* be *better*, for *all men* to be *made obedient*, than to be *sacrificed* in *hell* for ever, *without* end? And whether an Almighty Being has not *power*,—and an infinitely wise Being *wisdom*,---and an infinitely good Being *goodness*,----sufficient to *effect* that which is *better* or *best*? And we suggest to Philotheus the propriety of deciding, whether a *candid honest answer*, is not better than *evasion* and *equivocation*,—and if so, whether he had not better answer our interrogations than to *evade* them! We ask him, whether he does not "expect the wrath of God, for not obeying the Gospel?" And whether it is *obeying* the Gospel, to *deny* the salvation of God, and contend for the *good works* of the *creature*? And whether this conduct is "trusting *in* the *Lord*, and doing good?" The 18th chap. of Ezekiel, is a justification of God's dealing with the Jews. The subject is continued to the 19th chap. It is introduced into the 20th chap. at the 4th verse. From the 40th to the 44th verses inclusive, of this chapter, the purpose of God is made known; and it is *mercy* and not *sacrifice*. We believe that *fruits* of the *Spirit* mean, if the Spirit of God is spoken of, or intended, the *work* of God, not man. We are asked by Philotheus, the motive which James had, when he said, "As the body without the spirit is dead; so *faith* without works is dead also?" It is our opinion, that the apostle's motive, was to reprove those, whose *faith in* Christ is *merely* acknowledging his *person*, and *denying* his *works* of *salvation!* This is a dead faith. It has no *life*, except the *false hopes* which proceed from the *creature's* righteousness,—"filthy rags!"

The sixth paragraph of Philotheus, containing his 4th *cluster* of *queries*, is so highly *seasoned* with "*If's*," that we think it more than probable, that "*If*," Philotheus had *faith* enough to *believe* any thing *certain*, and had *courage* sufficient to have *ventured* it without sending *it* under *guard*, we should have taken *it* into particular consideration.

The seventh paragraph, numbered 5, &c. is as remarkable for *abounding* with *declarations*, as for being *destitute* of *proof*. Philotheus commences as usual, "If" so, and so, &c. The reader is requested to look at this paragraph, and save us the trouble of transcribing it. And as Philotheus has taken, what *he* perhaps might call *reason* as the criterion to judge the *question*, instead of the *Scriptures*, we shall take what *we call reason* and judge likewise. Philotheus says, "If," &c.—then it follows, that all are saved, &c., and death is the door, &c. If his premises are true, *reverse* the *cause*, and the *effect* will of necessity be *reversed*. Therefore, "*If*" Christ *did not* "*save* all men, completely, with an everlasting salvation about 1800 years ago," then it follows,—that *none are saved* from their sins,—and that *death* is the *door* to *eternal*, *immediate*, and *aionian* MISERY! Philotheus says, in *such* a *case*, (Christ being the Saviour of all men) "*If*" all, or any man fully believed this doctrine, I ask, what would prevent *him*, or *them*, from stealing, robbing, &c., and to make his *quietus*, and enter heaven, &c. *Ans.* GRATITUDE to God, for the *unmerited gift* of his *Son*, to be the *Saviour* of a *lost world*, would prevent it!!! And "*If*" gratitude will not produce obedience and love to God, what will? Is that *mercenary wretch*, whose soul is insensible to the calls of gratitude,—whom nothing noble can move,—whose *sensibility* can be awakened only by the lash, and who would outrage all the laws of his God, did not the torments of hell, and the rod of the devil restrain him,—Is HE the *picture*,—Is he the *sample* of your WHITE SONS? "If" so, hell is not *blacker* than his *lightest* shade.—Nor its perjured King less *grateful*, than *this* his *trembling*, but loyal *subject*? But "If," &c. not believing, &c. What then, Philotheus? Why every man would shun death as the most horrible thing in nature; and with good reason, if misery awaited them. We however appeal, to *even* the conscience of Philotheus, for the truth of our declaration, that his own statement, that under such circumstances, "To *murder* would be *good*," is FALSE! Philotheus will answer to his God for this. We neither *are*, nor want to be his judge. Philotheus says, he "was surprised, and wondered to see the Editor, *try* to *prove* John a blasphemer," &c., and refers to our 59th page, 3d column. We are surprised, and sorry for our correspondent's *sake*, that he should *pervert* our declaration. John declares, "that no murderer hath eternal life *abiding* IN *him*;" and John likewise declares, that the word of God is, that "we have eternal life *in his* Son." We again ask, "Is it not blaspheming the Holy Spirit to deny this?" What! Ans. That the murderer hath eternal life *in* the Son of God. If this is not truth, how can a murderer ever be saved? Nay more, how can the prophet David be saved? Was not he a murderer? Philotheus declares,—that the word *we*, does not refer to the world, &c. We ask, did Christ die for *we*, or for the *world*? Is Philotheus *vain* enough to suppose, that *his* declaration is of greater validity than the Oath of Jehovah, the declaration of all God's Prophets; of Christ, and all his Apostles? If so, we *pity* him *sincerely*. Philotheus refers to our 62d page, where we observed, that "there is no medium between good and evil." Christ is our authority, who says, "A good tree *cannot* bring forth corrupt fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. No man *can* serve two masters. He that *gathereth* not with me, scattereth abroad." The remarks which Philotheus has made *upon*, and we presume to *controvert*, or *ridicule* our, or more properly, the declaration of Christ, we shall not now notice any further, than to observe, that Philotheus had better *read* his *Bible*.

Philotheus' seventh paragraph, numbered 6, &c. is another string of declarations, without proof. "If," says Philotheus, implies condition. We will take it for granted this is the case, at least, so far as regards our correspondent. And "If" none but *holy* and *good* men are *in* Christ, "we ask Philotheus to point out the way in which *one* of the human race can be saved? The prophet and apostle declared," there is *none good*, no, not *one!*" And Christ declared, "There is none good but *one*, and that is God!" And the Apostle James declared, "in *many* things we *offend all!*" And John declared, "If we say *we* have *no sin*, we *deceive* ourselves; and the *truth* is *not* in us!" Now for the "If."—"If" Philotheus is *right*, the Scriptures are *wrong!* "If" Philotheus is *good* and *holy*, Christ is not his Saviour! For "Christ came, not to call the *righteous* but *sinners* to repentance! God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing *their trespasses* unto *them*" It would be absurd to talk of the *trespasses* of *good*, *holy* men! "Christ came to seek and save that which was lost;" and good holy men cannot be these. "Christ died for the *ungodly*;" and "If" for the ungodly, the good and holy have no part nor lot in the matter. The Scriptures declare, that we are "created *anew* in Christ," "If" the *good* and *holy* are created anew; what will they be in their new creation? If creation implies alteration, they must be altered into *bad* and *unholy*; and if they are already *good*,

where is the necessity of making them good? The Scriptures teach, that wicked unholy men are created anew in Christ, and *in him* are *holy*, as we have proved in our former answers to Philotheus. Our correspondent's concluding paragraph is like the rest, *declaration* without *proof*. Philotheus again declares, "I find conditions all through the Scriptures, of holy inspiration." And we again *challenge him* to produce one! Our last answer to him, in our 60th page, will inform him of his *obligation*; and we had much rather he would *perform*, than *promise*; and our readers, we believe, would be better satisfied with *proof*, than *declarations*, especially of the *kind* which Philotheus has so *long*, and to so *little* purpose, troubled them with.

Note.—We request Philotheus to turn to our 9th Number, 34th page, at the conclusion of his first paragraph, and he will see his *objection* as he first introduced it. In 10th Number, 37th page, third column, he will find evidence, "Hoc est argumentum ad hominem," *with a witness*, to prove him wrong! Philotheus is informed, that the Scriptures teach the doctrine, that "Christ was delivered for our offences, and rose again for our justification. Therefore, being justified, &c." Hoc est argumentum, &c. comes in with a good grace here. And if mankind are never saved, or justified, until they are holy in themselves, and without sin, they are never saved in their flesh; or in Philotheus' phraseology, if they are saved, they *are* holy,---mankind are *not* holy,---*ergo*, mankind are *not* saved,---now say, "Hoc est," &c. Philotheus is more than welcome to his conclusions; and we believe, he is by this time satisfied, that we do not *covet* his premises.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Sir,—In perusing your periodical publication, I have witnessed that pleasing sensation that clothes the mind of man, when he discovers a stranger stepping forth into the midst of the populace, and opposing with spirited zeal, those public opinions, which he had long warred against in secret, without either strength or means to declaim in a public manner. Such has been my feelings, while viewing your arguments against that blasphemous doctrine of eternal, endless misery; a doctrine, invented by the heathen world, and handed down by the queen of popery through a line of succeeding generations of the most uncharitable dispositions, to the baneful antichristian ministers of this age; who have affixed upon themselves the indelible stamp of the mark of the beast, by opening their mouths in blasphemies against God, his tabernacle, and them that dwell therein, by pronouncing, contrary to the plain testimony of sacred writ, this horrible doctrine of eternal misery, as consistent with the attributes of the Divine Mercy. And never was this Scripture more perfectly verified, "The wicked dig a pit and fall therein," than it is in that part of the community who generally have recourse to this text to prove their doctrine, "It is more profitable for thee to enter into life maimed, than to have two hands, or two feet, to be cast into the fire that never is to be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." This, say they, proves our doctrine of endless misery; and if it does, they will undoubtedly fall in the pit according to the text,---"For *every one* shall be *salted* with *fire*, and every sacrifice with salt." I rejoice to see this doctrine opposed in your publication; and although your ideas and mine might not exactly agree respecting hell, and the sufferings of the wicked, yet I could willingly assist you in defending the Divine character, by uniting my endeavours to remove this imaginary, or self-conceived doctrine of unlimited torture from the minds of our fellow men. But while I was gratified in examining your arguments against this blasphemous doctrine, I was shocked, and my pleasure was greatly embittered, when I discovered, that the doctrine of conditional salvation is denied by you. In this I do not agree with you, and have long waited with anxiety for a reply from some individual against this doctrine; which, to me, appears very dangerous. But as none have yet appeared that has been satisfactory to me, I am willing to enter into controversy with you on this subject, if you will candidly give my communications an insertion, and I will promise not to be very lengthy, but to adapt my communications to the limits of your paper. But before I proceed to controvert this subject, it becomes necessary to clear away the rubbish that will impede us in this engagement. There is an obstacle which presents itself, and unless it is removed, there cannot be any fair understanding. I mean the doctrine of original sin,—which if I am not mistaken, you adhere unto; and this difficulty must first be removed. Please to inform me in your next, what are your sentiments respecting the doctrine of original sin; and give me your reasons, or inform, whether you will receive and publish mine,—and I will attend thereunto as soon as practicable, and acknowledge the moment that I am convinced, if it is possible that I am mistaken. For I do sincerely believe, *first*,—that we have lost nothing by Adam's transgression. *Second*, that Adam and all his posterity were created, and born under the necessity of a Saviour, to regenerate them out of the image of Adam, or earthly nature, into the image of God, the Divine nature. And the Saviour is the seed, by which generated Adam is regenerated. And this seed was offered unto Adam and all his posterity, to receive, or reject at pleasure.

Dean.

REMARKS.

Although we are determined to oppose error, whenever, and wherever, we find it, still we cannot help noticing the candour of *Friend* Dean, who, although in our own opinion cherishing a gross error, appears to be so hearty in approving our endeavours to establish the truth, that we have a little more than common hopes of his acknowledging his own aberrations from the plain tenor of the Scriptures as relates to doctrine; and that he will, without much reluctance, throw them into the common heap, and let them all be scouted together. Wishing to have an auxiliary of so much candour and zeal, and at the same time to avoid as much as possible a lengthy and unprofitable *war* of *words*, we suggest to him the propriety and expediency, of immediately producing his *evidences* in favour of his *supposed* correct understanding of the Scriptures; for we assure him, that we have no disposition to obtain any advantage, other, than that superiority which is due to eternal truth, and which, of necessity, is in some measure the prerogative of all who are engaged in its defence, and who fight under its banners. We acknowledge, that this is a boon worth contending for. And we think Solomon was in the very meridian of his wisdom, and vigour of intellect, when he advised us "To buy the truth, and sell it not." To "get wisdom, and with all our gettings, to get understanding." We are very sorry to hear our correspondent express himself to be shocked at our belief of unconditional salvation. It sometimes occurs, that men are too proud, to receive gifts from their fellow men; but in this case, the exalted dignity of the Almighty Donor should, we think, remove, even from the minds of the most captious, every idea of obligation incurred unnecessarily; especially, when it is considered, that we already owe every thing to God, and the gift is of a nature which makes its acceptance doubly necessary, as we cannot do without the blessing offered, and cannot obtain it ourselves. And when it is considered, that salvation is throughout the Sriptures mentioned as a *gift*, and that general expressions convey the same idea, such as "Every good and perfect gift cometh from above," &c. That, "in God we live, move, and have our being, and in him are all our ways." And, "The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works;" and the declaration, "Who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again; for of him, and to him, and through him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen!" Surely it is unscriptural to talk of paying God; of complying with conditions. And reason is opposed to the very idea of paying for a gift. What! Is a gift conditional? If so, in what does it differ from a bargain between *Gripus* and his neighbour? The very idea of a conditional salvation, of necessity presupposes all future, and all uncertain. And the declaration, "I Am God, and beside me there is no Saviour;" admits of something more than questioning, if man can save himself. And to say, that salvation is conditional, and that man can do nothing towards his salvation, involves the strange absurdity, of a cause which can produce no effect, or of an effect without a producing cause. And to say, that salvation is conditional, and that man can do something, and can save save himself, or help save himself, is giving the glory, or taking the glory of salvation from God, and giving, or assigning it to man. And to say, that salvation is conditional, and that the condition on the part of man, does not contribute in the least towards his salvation, is to declare, in the most unqualified manner, that *salvation is not conditional*. These conclusions, we believe, cannot be avoided. To say, that God would sacrifice, or permit the devil to sacrifice millions of his creatures to an etiquette, which would disgrace a petty prince of a German electorate, is, if not blasphemous, at least too contemptible to merit a serious refutation!

Our correspondent says, "I am willing to enter into controversy with you upon this subject, *unconditional salvation*, if you will candidly give my communications an insertion," &c. We assure him, that his communications shall be published with candour, and if it is not presuming too much, answered with effect.

Relative to clearing away the rubbish, we promise him we shall do our best as soon as we have an opportunity. And the rubbish we allude to, is the strange effects of original sin, exemplified in the heterogeneous notions and opinions which are abroad in the world; and which, if they are not the beast mentioned in the Revelations, have, at least, as many *heads* and *horns*.

Our opinion relative to what is called original sin, is expressed in few words. We understand the word *original*, as used in this question, to mean the *first sin* or *evil*, which must be considered to be the contrast of *good*, which existed in the human family; and the question, whether this sin originated in the human family, once settled, would, we think, produce the "fair understanding" which our correspondent so properly wishes. The Scriptures inform us, that God made man *upright*, in the *image* of *God*, and that God pronounced *him* very *good*. We consider this conclusive against the hypothesis, that sin *originated* in man. For the Scriptures declare, that "A *good tree* cannot bring forth *corrupt*, or *evil* fruit." The Scriptures likewise declare, that "God is *good*, and that with him there is no variableness nor shadow of turning." Sin, therefore, did not proceed from God. The Scriptures declare, that the "devil is the father of lies." Consequently, the *original* sinner, *progenitor*, and *author* of *sin*, or *moral evil*.

Our correspondent's declaration, "That Adam, and all his posterity were created, and born under the necessity of a Saviour, to regenerate them *out* of the *image* of *Adam*, or *earthly nature*, into the *image* of God, &c., and the Saviour's being the seed by which *generated* Adam is *regenerated*, &c.—involves *questions*, and *contradicts* testimony, which, we think, will *seriously* trouble Friend Dean to get along with. We are afraid, that he has not counted the cost,—and as he says he will acknowledge the moment he is convinced, we are not without our hopes of hearing him preach a better doctrine. We hope Friend Dean will excuse us, when we say, that we expect the Scriptures are to be the umpire in this business. We, however, are willing to admit any book in evidence that is of greater *antiquity* and better recommended than the Bible. And further, if testimony can be produced from any man, better acquainted, and under greater advantages to obtain information, than the *prophets* and *apostles* of Christ, who received advice from the Saviour himself, we are willing to admit him, &c. In fine, every man who can *raise* the *dead*, cure the *palsy* in a *moment* by *speaking*, shall be admitted as witnesses, and have a *candid* and patient hearing. But, every *pretender*, every *one* who has nothing but his *own* declaration to back him, shall be *turned* out of court without any ceremony! Having, therefore, accepted thy challenge, and chosen our weapons, we only wait for thee Friend Dean to come on the ground, and then we will commence the combat!

Encouraged by the words of Paul, who says, "Finally my brethren, *be strong in the Lord*, and in the power of *his might*. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the *rulers* of the *darkness of this world*, against *spiritual wickedness* in high *places*. Wherefore, take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, *and having done all*, TO STAND. *Stand therefore*, having your loins girt about with *truth*, and having on the breast-plate of *righteousness*; and *your feet shod* with the GOSPEL OF PEACE; above all taking the *shield of faith*, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the *fiery darts* of the wicked. And take the *helmet of* SALVATION, and the SWORD *of the* SPIRIT, which is the WORD OF GOD." Accoutred in this impenetrable armour, WE STAND, and *boldly* and *fearlessly* declare,—that "*All* nations whom God hath made shall come and worship before him, and shall glorify his name; and all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto God, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him; for God is the Maker of all things; the God of the spirits of all flesh. Have we not *all one Father*, *hath not one God created us?* For all things were made by him and for him; and GOD IS THE SAVIOUR OF ALL MEN." ALL who deny these truths, whether CLERGYMEN, or LAYMEN,---WE DARE THEM TO THE COMBAT! The *columns* of *this paper* are at their service. We will not, like *Goliath* of old, *curse* you in the name of our gods,---we will *bless* you in the name of the "God of the spirits of all flesh,"—for he hath commanded us to *bless*, and *curse* not. Our breast-plate is the *Redeemer's righteousness*, not *our own; faith* in God's promises, is our *shield*,---and our *feet* is shod *with the gospel of peace*,---our *helmet* is *not* DAMNATION,---but SALVATION; and our SWORD,---the OMNIPOTENT WORD OF GOD!!! Come on then,---and we will give your *errors* to the *adversary*, to whom they belong,---*destroy* your *enmity*, and make you *friends*, and *all* rally round the standard of the TRIUMPHANT SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD!

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—It is not my intention to write for controversy, but for the establishment of truth. I think, Sir, that you misunderstand this passage altogether. Luke, 13th chap. 2d and 3d verses. The Editor says, our correspondent must prove that the perishing here spoken of, is the perishing of the soul. I grant, that the perishing spoken of in the 1st and 4th verses, alludes to the body; but, the perishing spoken of in the 3d verse, is the *soul*, and *not* the *body* Now, it cannot mean, if we do not repent, we shall be crushed to pieces in a building; for how many *good* men have lost their lives in a building? What is the difference, whether we die, by a building falling on us, or die in the *best bed* which the world can afford, if the soul is saved at last? What I understand by *repentance*, is, to *feel a great sorrow* for sin, and forsake it. It is to *turn* from *false hopes*. The Editor again says, that in Mark, 16th chap. 16th verse, our correspondent "if he had examined our remarks on Philotheus, would have seen, that he is bound to tell, what it is that we are to believe, the belief of which will save us." Why, believe that Christ is the Son of God,---believe the Gospel, and the Gospel is good news,---and the good news is, if we repent, he will save us; because Jesus is the Saviour of the world; and he will *save all* that come to him, and *no more*. Believe *this*, from the heart, and we shall be saved from eternal death. Again, the Editor says, in Matthew, 7th chap. 7th verse, "Our correspondent ought to recollect, that he is bound to tell what it is we are to ask for, &c." Why, ask God to pardon our sins, for Christ's sake. Knock at the door of grace; seek God, &c.

MILETUM.

REMARKS.

Our motive is, or ought to be, the detection of error, and establishment of truth. And we have no disposition to avail ourselves of any advantage that we might derive from the ignorance or mistakes of others. We, therefore, inform our correspondent, that he is labouring under a mistaken idea of the passage quoted from Luke, 13th chap. and instead of the Editor, it is Miletum who "has misunderstood it altogether." Miletum says, "I grant, that the perishing spoken of in the *first* and *fourth* verses, alludes to the body, but the perishing spoken of in the 3d verse is the soul." If Miletum looks again, he will find, that there are none spoken of as perishing, but those Galileans who are mentioned in the first verse, and who are referred to in the 2d and 3d verses and those in the 4th verse, on whom the tower in Siloam fell, &c. Consequently, Miletum's premises and deductions are destroyed by his *own* conclusions. Miletum says, "What I understand by repentance, is, to feel a great sorrow for sin, and forsake it." Did not Judas feel a *great* sorrow for his sin of betraying his Lord and Master? Did he not forsake it, and return the money he received for committing it, and declare, I have betrayed innocent blood? He done even more than Miletum has stated; he confessed his sins. Will this *great sorrow* save sinners? If so, where was the necessity of any other Saviour? Why did Christ die? Is not "*great sorrow*" another name for salvation, than the name Jesus? If so, can it save? We think not. Miletum adds, "It is to forsake false hopes." Would not a hope of salvation founded on great sorrow be false? Is it "*great sorrow*," or "the blood of Jesus, which cleanseth from all sin?" And are not *all* hopes false, but the *hopes* which have for their foundation the blood of Christ? And if Jesus saves from all sin, how can repentance, or great sorrow save? Miletum says, "If we believe that Christ is the Son of God,---believe the Gospel,---and the Gospel is good news,---and the good news *is*, if *we repent*, HE will save us." Is it possible that Miletum does not see the gross inconsistency and contradiction, which he has uttered? If we believe, *our believing* will *save* us,---because, he, Christ, will save us! We ask, if it is Christ who saves us, how can our believing do it? And if it is our faith or belief, how can it be Christ? Did not Christ save the world by the offering of himself, and the gathering unto himself on the cross all mankind? And if this is true, are we not saved, before we believe? And are we not called upon to believe the truth, that Christ has already saved us? Or does Christ become our Saviour, when we believe that he is our Saviour? If this is the case, and we are not saved by Christ, until we believe, what truth is there in the declaration of Paul to the Colossians, "And having, (not will have, if you will believe,) made peace through the blood of his cross, by him (not by our believing) to reconcile all things unto himself, by him, I say, whether things on earth, or things in heaven." Miletum says, "We must ask God to pardon our sins for Christ's sake." If God pardons our sins for Christ's sake, he will pardon them without our asking, otherwise it would be, not for Christ's sake, but because we asked him! Miletum says, "we must knock at the door of grace." Christ says "he is the door," &c. We ask, is Christ the door which Miletum means? If so, he is informed, that knocking at the door of great sorrow, or knocking at the door of *repentance*, or the *belief* or *faith* of the *creature*, is not knocking at the door of Christ! Miletum says, "Jesus is the Saviour of the world." We ask him, how Jesus can be the Saviour of the world, if the *world is not saved by him?* If you were standing on the brink of a precipice, and a man were to tell you he would save you, if you would comply with certain conditions, and you either *did not*, or *could not*, no matter which, and you fell and were crushed to death, could that man say, in truth, that he saved you? No! The very idea of such a thing is absurd beyond description. Christ declared, that he came to save the world. And he declared, that he finished the work he came to do. Therefore, the world is saved. And all hopes of salvation, except by the cross of Christ, are false. If mankind were the disciples of Christ, and loved one another, they would be willing that all should be saved. But they are not his disciples. They are the disciples of Calvin, Luther, Arminius, Hopkins, &c., and hate one another; and believe, that Christ will save them, and make their neighbours whom they hate, miserable. God be praised, these delusions of the devil are hastening with rapid strides to oblivion; and the religion of Christ fast spreading throughout the world.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—In looking over your 16th Number, I observe some few passages, which need explanation, at least, if they do not require to be materially corrected. The communication of Halcyon, for example, commences with the following sentence: "A religious life has generally been considered by those who are called orthodox, to be compounded of alternate scenes of doubt, of gloomy melancholy, and the reviving rays of returning hope."—Now, I have read many standard authors, styled orthodox, on this very subject, without learning that any one of them considered a religious life the compound which is here described. Indeed, I never suspected that any, even of the more ignorant class of private Christians, conceived such an idea of it, until the above statement met my eye. If Halcyon can substantiate this statement, the public are certainly entitled to the proof. If he cannot, I submit it to himself, whether a strict regard to candour, and the spirit of Christian charity, would not urge him to correct it.

Under the head of the doctrine of "The unpardonable sin, examined and confuted," the following passage occurs:—"Shall every principle which has any foundation to produce confidence, every sentiment which can inspire charity, and that faith, which alone can create love, and that doctrine which can make that love universal in its operation; shall all these be sacrificed at the shrine of a demon, whose temple is ingulphed in an ocean of blood, the oblations of his worshippers? Whose justice is cruelty, and whose mercy is favouritism? Who is approached with fear, loved without affection, and served from necessity; who rewards without merit, and damns without crime? Whose reign is terror, whose frown is destruction, and whose displeasure is damnation and misery?" Horrible! most horrible! I will be the first to trample on the authority of such a God, if I do not cast the first stone at his apologists and worshippers. But, in sober truth, whither shall I go to find the more than half crazed devotees who make this fearful sacrifice? I have been for many years familiarly conversant with Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Unitarians and Trinitarians, New-lights and Old-lights, Calvinists and anticalvinists, those who advocate the Universal doctrine, and those who discard it; but the man who makes the sacrifice, or worships the god above described, I have not found. I have heard of a certain Juggernaut in Hindostan, who is a very ugly and cruel god; but even he, with his blood-stained mouth, and the bones of his worshippers whitening around his temple, and their mangled corpses clogging the wheels of his ponderous car, does not come up to this description. I, therefore, place this among the few passages which need a comment from the writer. Without such explanation I find myself at a loss to divine, to what class of regionists or race of rational creatures it can be applied. A few sentences after this passage it is asked, "And if God commands his crea-

tures to forgive their enemies, because it is good, will not God do good likewise, and forgive his enemies? Reader, would it not be blasphemous to answer this in the negative?"

Every reader of this miscellany is, I apprehend, prepared to admit, and strenuously affirm, that God will do good, and only what is good; that there is also forgiveness with him even for the most criminal offender. But from the tenor of his remarks, the writer appears to assume it as a self-evident principle, that the circumstance of God's requiring men to forgive their *private* enemies, cannot well consist with his withholding forgiveness from the *public* enemies of his character and moral government; that is, he cannot, as the universal Ruler and Judge, punish his offending subjects and disturbers of the public peace, with more propriety, and more consistently with the dictates of benevolence, than they can individually revenge themselves on each other. But who does not perceive that the authority with which the Prince, and especially the Almighty King, is clothed, may allow and require him to exhibit, on some occasions, a righteous severity, and inflict a punishment, from which the *private feelings* of his *rational* subjects *here* would *recoil?* Is it not matter of fact, that Jehovah has exercised *this severity*, on *more* than one occasion? Show me the individual who would not *blush* to avow the desire of drowning *his* enemies indiscriminately? But the righteous Jehovah brought a flood of waters upon the sinners of the old world. The *hardest human heart* is melted at the sight of a generous *animal* suffering death by torture, or struggling in agony against the fury of devouring flame. What, then, would be *our emotions*, were we but to witness the scene of a populous city, with its inhabitants, of every character and age, wrapt in one conflagration. Yet Jehovah actually overwhelmed the cities of the plain with a deluge of fire. It cannot be necessary to remind the writer of the destruction of Korah and his company, the very sight of which affected the spectators with indescribable *horror!* No person of *common humanity* would be willing to *inflict* so *terrible* a *destruction* on *his* most *inveterate foe!* And it will be recollected, that these are examples of punishment, which *could not* have been *intended* to *reform*, because they actually *destroyed* the sufferers. They are, moreover, left on record, as instances of the Divine indignation against sin,—an indignation which spent itself, *not* on *Satan*, the *tempter* to all iniquity, but on *men*, the guilty actors.

Shall we then infer, from these examples, that the righteous Lord of all, possessed *less* of *benevolence* than *sinful men*, whose humanity does not permit them to take the lives of their enemies in any form? God forbid. The only legitimate conclusion is, that we are not warranted in inferring from our humanity and benevolence, as fellow beings and private individuals, or our *natural affections*, as relatives and *parents*, what other men may properly do, as public magistrates and guardians of a nation's liberties; much less what the moral Governor and Judge of the universe may, as the alone Guardian of his own rights and those of *his* creatures. It will be perceived, that I do not, by these remarks, impugn the doctrine of Universal Salvation. I merely *expose* the *baseless* structure of a principle, which does not, in its application, agree either to *fact* or common sense;—a *principle* which is, nevertheless, often *resorted* to by a certain class of reasoners, and urged with no *common assurance.* The cause of *truth* has little need of such supports,—and it is in *vain* that they are used to prop up the falling ruins of error.

MIKROSS.

ANSWER.

Halcyon "is of age; he will speak for himself." For ourselves, we are happy in having opportunity to answer before the public, respecting all the things whereof we are accused by *Mikross* this day. And first, we shall testify to Mikross. that our description of a demon existing in the imaginations of thousands, was no hyperbole. We have ourselves heard, and it was not told by another, of a God, who, almighty in power, would exert that power to torture, with inconceivable and horrid sufferings, nine-tenths of the human race. That his anger, roused with fury, should raise his voice to speak in thunders, burst the tombs, and wake to agony the sleeping dead, whose scattered dust should reunite in their *old image* of corruption, sin, and death;—and that instead of *blood*, and the *juices* which once flowed through their *arteries*, *veins*, and *pores*,—*liquid fire and brimstone should circulate to all eternity!* And God would unite and bend the whole force of his infinite power to *torment* them *with* devils *for ever!* And this *was* his *purpose* in their *creation.* This subject is too disgusting to dwell on;—we could answer for every particular.—One more remark, and we have done. Can that man *love* with affection, who has declared, "that he believes a number of his children will be damned in a hell of fire and brimstone for ever; and that the sight and knowledge of their torments will increase his happiness in heaven?" This is no fable. We have seen the abominable wretch who disgraced his whole species by this inexpressibly accursed declaration. It is our firm belief, that if the devil himself could have a legitimate offspring, he would regard that offspring with feelings *less* cruel than these! We inform Mikross, that the class of religionists, to whom this unnatural wretch belonged, was the *Hopkinsian!*

Mikross' next animadversion on our answer to Cicilia, would, we think, have looked better if he had only produced so much as one evidence from the scriptures, relative to God's character, as Father, and King, or Governor, in support of his declarations. We, however, shall recur to the scriptures, for evidence of the truth and propriety of our declaration. Previously to doing this, we shall examine, whether our declaration will not, as Mikross says, "*agree* in its application, either to *fact*, or *common sense.*" We acknowledge, that "we have often resorted to it in support of truth;" and we, in so doing, only follow the example of Christ, who, in the 5th chapter of Matthew, 43d verse to the end of the chapter, makes use of this rule of reasoning. Here is one fact, at least, which our declaration is not inconsistent with, whatever it may be with common sense. How many kinds of justice, or mercy, or goodness, does common sense teach us there is in the world? Mikross teaches that there are *two kinds*,—and his arrangement involves the strange conclusion, that God's justice, and *goodness too*, are of *a kind*, which, according to Mikross, would *disgrace* a *man* to *imitate*;—for, alluding to God's conduct, he says, "No person of *common humanity* would be *willing* to *inflict* so *terrible a destruction* on his *most inveterate foe!*" We believe the troops of Korah did not suffer so much, by being instantaneously crushed in the closing earth, as many people suffer in the course of 24 hours with the *tooth-ache!* The scriptures inform us, "That the Lord is *good* to *all*, and his *tender mercies* are over *all his works.*" If this is true, the tender mercies of the Lord, according to Mikross, are *what* men would *recoil from.* Mikross says, humanity does not permit man to take the life of his enemy? What is it, then, which permits the millions of men to wage war and murder one another? Is every man who shoulders his musket destitute of humanity? Or is the humanity of men who kill their enemies, and this is done by individuals, and nations of individuals,—is their humanity so *tender*, their *mercy* so *good*, and their *benevolence* so *great*, that "they *recoil*," or start back with horror! at the sight of the conduct of that Being, who "rended the heavens, and came down," *died* for *his* enemies, and *prayed* for *blessings* on the *heads* of *those*, by whose *hands* he was *slain?* A man might, by viewing a surgical operation, be affected to that degree, that he would faint, and lose his consciousness for the time being. And did any man view a surgeon amputating the *arm* or *leg* of a *man*, and see the man *tied*, and unable to *stir*,—and were he unacquainted with the *benefit* to result to the *sufferer* by the *amputation*, he no doubt would *express* himself in *terms* as *unjustifiable* of the *surgeon*, as *Mikross* has *done* of the Almighty Physician, "who in the *multitude* of his *mercies* will have *compassion*, for he doth not *afflict willingly*, nor *grieve* the children of men."

The distinction which Mikross has made, of "public and private enemies," &c., is, in our opinion, as respects God in his dealings with his creatures, not susceptible of any thing like argument. There is an *old orthodox saying*, which has been for a great number of years sanctioned by almost every thing but the *scriptures* and *common sense*,—that "God punishes the *sins* of *nations* in *this* world, and of *individuals* in a *future* state," &c. Now this is, on the whole, an enormous absurdity; for it supposes, *first*—that nations and individuals have no more relation, than our laws make in the crimes of *arson* and stealing *chickens.*—*Second*—that notwithstanding *sin* is *infinite*, and *deserves* an *infinite* punishment, the *infinite* sins of *millions* are *passed over* with the *trifling* chastisement of a *few moments*,—and the infinite sins of *one* man, or an *individual*, is *punished* with something *more* than a *few* hundred thousand millions of millions of *ages* of misery;—and when this is backed with the declarations, "That God has an infinite *aversion* to sin, and is *no respecter* of persons, but will reward every man according to his works," &c., we think there is no doubt but it appears *infinitely reasonable* and *just* to some of our *divine doctors!*

(To be concluded next week.)

To Correspondents.

J. B. Relly, and an Impartialist are received, and shall appear in our next.

Those of our correspondents who are in the habit of writing a *great deal* on a *little paper*, are informed, that by proportioning their paper to their matter, they will confer a favour on the Editor and printer, &c

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1820. NO. 20.

Answer to Mikross.

(Concluded.)

Suppose that this *diplomatically divine logick* was true,—and the congress of the United States were to sanction all kind of sin and iniquity, the indulgence *in*, and perpetration of all sin by individuals would then be *national*, and there would not be any such thing as *punishment* or misery in a *future* state, or *another* world! If this doctrine is true, our government could not subserve the interest of the American people so effectually any other way, as they could, by making *infinite* sin *finite* in its effects, and they could justly say in that case, that they had conferred *infinite* benefits on the governed!

Mikross, speaking of the destruction of Sodom by *fire*, and the troops of Korah, &c., by the *earthquake*, says,—"And it will be recollected, that these are *examples of punishment*, which *could not* have been *intended to reform*, because they *actually* destroyed the sufferers." We think the declaration "*could not*,"—and the reason assigned, why it "*could not*," will *not* stand the test. We appeal to the reason of the reader, whether Mikross has not represented the Almighty Maker and Father, as destroying his *works* and his *children*, without any regard to their welfare? What *more, or worse*, could the devil, the adversary, have done? Such conclusions are repugnant to reason and common sense. The Scriptures are decidedly against this conclusion, which, if not absolutely blasphemous, approaches it so near, that we believe even Mikross would find it difficult to discriminate! There is *one position* which *we take*, and take for ever!—videlicet,—God, "*our heavenly* FATHER," *will, in all his dealings* with *all* men, and *all are his children*, have their happiness in view, and in all things consult their good, with a constancy, perseverance, sincerity, and success, as far superior to, and greater than the best earthly PARENT that ever lived, as HEAVEN is HIGHER than the EARTH, or the EAST is *distant* from the WEST! This is our firm belief. And we are persuaded, that the *things of time*, or the *events of eternity*, will NEVER ALTER IT! Let Mikross *measure our zeal* by our *faith*, and recollecting *his remark*, endorsed on the *envelope* of his communication, that he "asked no favour for his sentiments," and he will, we trust, not *complain* of not receiving any. We ask Mikross, where he obtained his authority, for saying, that the destruction of the inhabitants of Sodom, could not reform or benefit them? Were they annihilated? If not, if they continued to exist after the loss of their natural lives, they could be reformed. And all things being possible with God, we think it is possible from the goodness of God, who has "no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but rather that he should turn and live," that the destruction of Sodom was a benefit to them. God speaking by his prophet Ezekiel, relative to these very Sodomites, says, they were more righteous than the Israelites. See 16th chap. And he "took them away as he saw *good*." The word *good*, is supplied by the translators. Whether the connexion, and the character of God, "who is good to all," will not justify this mode of expression, we leave to Mikross to determine. The Scriptures teach, that "God chasteneth whom he loveth," &c. And when it is considered that God is not *partial*, and is no respecter of persons,—and it is likewise considered, that these very Sodomites are declared by God, who knew their characters, not to be so corrupt as the Israelites, the declaration of Mikross, is accusing God of injustice in his dealings with the Sodomites, if their reformation or benefit was not intended,—or, as our translators have rendered it, if they were not "taken away as God saw *good*." Surely Mikross will not deny, but God knew what was best for them! One thing is certain,—it is not happiness to live in the perpetration of the grossest sins. And the Sodomites leading miserable lives, in consequence of their corrupt minds, could not lose any thing by dying,—and might be really benefited by a change in their mode of being. God will never make men miserable. The devil might, if he had power,—and they frequently make themselves miserable. We, therefore, believe, that God took them from their miserable state to a *good*, or *better* state,—not to a worse state! God is *a* Saviour,—the devil is *the* destroyer. And the deluded inhabitants of Sodom were, by his deceptions, in "bodies of sin and death;" and their works were tried by fire, agreeably to Paul's declaration, and they did *not abide*; they, therefore, suffered the loss,—or suffered *while* they were *losing* their corrupt bodies, *yet so*, as themselves were saved, but by fire! And the Scriptures declare, "By *fire* and by the sword, will God plead with *all flesh*, and the slain of the Lord shall be many." This same 16th chap. of Ezekiel, declares, that these Sodomites shall return to their former estate. The Apostle Paul says, "The creature was made subject to vanity, *not willingly*, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know, that the WHOLE CREATION groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption,"—we ask,—what adoption? Paul answers, "*to wit*,—the redemption of our body!" We ask from what? Ans. From sin and death. To say that a man is made subject to any thing before he has an existence, is absurd. The first state of man was perfect, being in the image of God. Man lost this image,—or was made subject to vanity or sin, not willingly,—*id est*,—man did not, knowing *sin* or *vanity*, choose sin or vanity,—it was not his choice, &c. The same apostle, in another place, speaking of man's fall, or being made subject to vanity, says, "The man *was not* deceived, but the woman was deceived." The vanity, therefore, came first, to the woman, or Eve, by deception; she could not be said to be *willing*, for she was deceived in the nature of it, &c. And the man was then subjected in hope. For God revealed to him, that the *seed* of the *very* woman who gave way to the deception or vanity, should deliver all his posterity from the *bondage of corruption*, &c. A delivery from this, and reinstation in the image of God, is the first estate to which the Sodomites shall return, agreeably to God's declaration by Ezekiel his prophet! We submit it to Mikross, whether the destruction of Sodom, could not have been under this view of the subject, a benefit to them, and tending to their good and reformation, &c. We do not wish to be understood, as saying, or inferring, or admitting in the most distant manner whatever, that the destruction of their bodies could, or would save their souls. They are saved by Christ. The destruction of their bodies, and change of their *mode* and place of existence, might,—nay more,—it certainly could, in the providence of God, facilitate their knowledge of God and his salvation, and their happiness would flow as a natural result from their knowledge of it.

We have not, at present, room for further remarks on the deductions of Mikross We hope, however, he will be satisfied, that our view of God in all his dealings with his creatures, is consistent with the Scriptures, which represent him in the glorious characters of Father, Saviour, and Sanctifier, or Purifier, of his children, the family of man; and we will with pleasure admit, that our conclusions and views are inconsistent with that *common sense*, which is the currency of Calvinists, Hopkinsians, and Arminians.

COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

What will cause unity of faith, in the bonds of unspeakable peace?

SIR,—If I was not mistaken in my communication in Number 10, pages 89 and 40, relative to a multiplicity of faiths, I may proceed to essay an answer to the above inquiry.

In the communication alluded to, it is inquired, "If our faith proceeds from the real knowledge of God, conveyed to us through the medium of his Spirit, where is the cause of difference?" I answer, there is none; because it is removed by true knowledge, through God's own medium. Let this be the case with all who profess Christ; then we shall all be of one heart and of one mind; no building upon any other foundation, than the revelation of God to man. I do not mean a typical revelation, for we see what a Babel is produced by building on this, instead of the *one only availing name*, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. See the multiplicity of faiths, but not of the Lord, and the variety of names, but not from the true God. Hundreds, nay, I was going to say, thousands of names have arisen since the days of the apostles, professing the religion of Christ, and still the way is open, and broad as the world, for an inconceivable number more. What shall we say to these things, "If God is for us, who can be against us?" Very true, —but can he be for us, unless we have his Spirit? "They which have not the Spirit of Christ, are none of his." Can we have his Spirit while we differ, nay, quarrel about religion? Is not this a carnal state? Such as the apostle reproved, when he said to the Corinthians, For ye are yet carnal, for whereas there is among you, envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal? Is not this a fleshly state and hateful to God? Most certainly, for they which are in the flesh cannot please him. Come then, Christian professors, flee these things; flee from sin, as from a serpent, and return unto the Lord, who will have mercy, and to our God, who will abundantly pardon. Let his Spirit be our God, our guide, light, life, comfort, and our hope. Then, and not till then, shall we have the cause within us, which will produce unity, one with another; unity of faith in the love of God, in the effectual operation of his Holy Spirit upon us, which as we abide its operations, will cement us in the bonds of unspeakable peace.

AN IMPARTIALIST.

REMARKS.

We think it proper, to observe, that the declaration of the Apostle, quoted by our correspondent, "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;" is, in our opinion, frequently misunderstood. Are we to understand the Apostle to say, that the man who has not the Spirit of Christ is none of, or does not belong to Christ? This would be denying the most plain, and unequivocal testimony of the Scriptures, which declare, that "All things were made by him, and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist;" It is evident, therefore, that all men belong to Christ, whether they have this Spirit or not. Consequently, it must be, that Christ is not the unbeliever's, or his, who, according to Paul's understanding, has not the Spirit of Christ. Again, it is frequently argued, that a man's salvation depends upon really having the Spirit of Christ in himself literally and fully in

this present life. If this is truth, we can only add, we fear that none of the human race will be saved. We believe the Spirit of Christ is the God of the whole earth, beside whom there is none else. And the idea of having a part of the Deity, or Spirit of Christ, in us, would not, we think, be sufficient to answer the full purport of the words. Is there a man living, who has the fulness of the Godhead bodily dwelling in him? If there is, he is holy, and without sin; and must, like Christ, be perfect as the Father is perfect. Holiness is an attribute of Jehovah; and it would not be more absurd, for a man to pretend to possess the Almighty power, or Infinite wisdom of God, than to pretend to possess his holiness. But the man who declares, that the Spirit of Christ is in him, either declares, that he has in him the Almighty power, Infinite wisdom, and Unbounded goodness of God, or, if he denies the conclusion, and contends for the truth of his premises, he denies that the Spirit, or God, is possessed of these, his eternal and unchangeable attributes! We believe, that an examination of this 8th chap. to the Romans, will convince every candid, unprejudiced mind, that what Paul means by having the Spirit of Christ, is having the faith of Christ, or rather, a knowledge of the faith of Christ; which is, to the believer, a foundation for his hopes of salvation, in contradistinction to the works of the law,—and is that faith, which is described to "work by love and purify the heart." He is, therefore, Christ's, and Christ is his Saviour, and he believes with Paul, that no power can be able to separate him from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus his Lord. If any person should contend, that we do really have the Spirit of Christ, and that Christ, or God, does really dwell in, and inhabit our bodies in this life, and that it is not *faith* which the apostle means, when he says, the Spirit of Christ,—we ask such person, whether he believes, that those who have this Spirit are really, not in the flesh, or out of the flesh, according to the literal meaning of the words,—and if they understand *one* part to be *figurative*, whether the same figurative understanding of the *other* part, is not only justifiable, but necessary. We believe this 8th chap. to the Romans contains much important doctrine, and is a key to many other parts. Paul was a consistent preacher, and, like his Divine Master, aimed to instruct, and not mislead. And it is evident, that Paul described under the two characters, *carnal* and *spiritual*, all mankind. Paul describes the believer, or spiritual man, to be *dead*,—the unbeliever or carnal man to be alive; the 7th chap. is explanatory of this view of the subject. The 9th chap. 30th and 31st verses, contains another, and perhaps plainer view of the two characters, or descriptions of men,—"What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followed after the *law* of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? (Why not? What was the cause? *Ans.*) Because *they sought it* not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law." Here are two prominent features of doctrine,—first, the *carnal* are those, who are seeking justification by their own works under the law; and the *faith*, to which those, who attained to the law of righteousness, but not by their *own* works under, or in conformity to the law, is a *convertible* term for *spirit*, as used by Paul, in the 8th chap. 1st, 2d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 13th, and 15th verses, &c. Paul says, "For to be carnally minded is death,"—why so? Ans. The law requires perfect obedience,—no man can, in his own person, render perfect obedience to the law,—"He that offendeth in one point, is guilty of all,—in many things we offend all,"—therefore, to be carnally minded, or to suppose that our righteousness, which is of the law (in our estimation it is so, and our hopes, if we are carnally minded, are in proportion to our opinion of *our* own righteousness, not that of Christ,) is our title to heaven,—therefore, death, or fear of death, will inevitably be the lot of all those who build on this sandy foundation. "But to be spiritually minded is life, and peace." Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, 2d chap. 16th and 20th verses, explains what he means by being spiritually minded, or having the Spirit of Christ. "Knowing that a man is not *justified* by the *works* of the *law* but by the *faith* of *Jesus Christ*; even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be *justified* by the *faith of Christ*, and not by the works of the law; for by the *works of the law*, shall *no flesh be justified*. I am crucified with Christ,—nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the *faith* of the Son of God, who gave himself for me." The commands of God are imperative,—they must be obeyed,—Paul knew this,—he knew, that without holiness, no man should see the Lord,—and he declared, that when the law came, he died,—he, when he had the faith of Christ, saw himself, in the Head of human nature, clean,—therefore, Paul could say with propriety, "The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God,"—in other words, the law of God is the standard, or criterion by which we are to be measured,—no man can be justified by the law, for no man can stand this test; Christ is our justification,—I am, or was crucified with him,—and I now live in, or according to the *flesh*, or *law*,—but it is not myself, or my own righteousness and works, which are in conformity to the law, *but the righteousness of Christ*, who gave himself for me, &c. "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, (who believe they are in Christ reconciled,) who walk, *not* after the *flesh*, (who do not *expect* to be saved because they are *better* than their neighbours, and because they *obey the law*,) but after the Spirit." See the 2d, 3d, and 4th verses of this 8th chap. The reader is likewise requested, to look at our 11th Number, 41st page, 1st and 2d columns.

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor,—Since I have made a public profession of the sentiment of the loving-kindness of God towards all men, probably very few days have passed, without a declaration from some opposer of the above sentiment; and made generally in the following words:; "If I believed that all men would be saved, I would do as I please." Such a declaration, falling from the lips of professors of Christianity, have led me to reflect in the following manner. Are they sincere, when they make the observation? What do they mean, when they say, they would live as they please? How do they live? Do they follow virtue? If they do, is it their pleasure so to live; and if it is their *pleasure to follow virtue*, could they *not continue* in that *pleasure* and believe, that "God will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth?" On the other hand, not believing the "Glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people," therefore, they do *not live* as they *please*; and why? Believing that endless misery is in reserve for all transgressors, they *cease* to transgress, in order to *escape* the misery that would otherwise overtake them. It appears, that the above *spirit* is not very unlike the following: A citizen of this state, says, If I believed I should not receive any punishment from the good people of this state, I would do as I please; that is, I would give full latitude to all my evil desires; disregarding the rights or comforts of any. Now, what is the disposition of him who makes such a declaration, if he really speaks the truth when it is made? I think, it is not very different from this,—his very bosom is swelled with the desire to commit all manner of vice; and the only thing that binds him (*not to virtue*) and keeps him *from* open transgression, is the spirit of *fear*. Now, will any one say, that this person is really a good citizen? We presume not. Is he a Christian, who with this disposition would sally forth and prey upon the rights of men, if he thought he would not have to endure endless punishment? As well might we call the *assassin* a civil man in society, because he is bound in chains, which prevents him from doing mischief, as to call him a Christian, or a follower of the meek and lowly Saviour, who is prevented from the commission of all manner of wickedness, because he is *bound by the chains of fear*. The east, and the west, are not farther separated, one from the other, than this spirit is from the spirit of true Christianity. The writer does not desire to give offence to any; but believing that many persons, not being aware of the portrait they draw of their own characters, when they make this declaration, has induced him to trouble *them* with these remarks. I will close, by requesting them to take into serious consideration the words of the apostle, "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, and hating one another; but after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour towards man appeared, *not* by *works* of righteousness, which *we have done*, but according to *his mercy* he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, and the grace of God, which bringeth salvation unto all men, hath appeared, teaches us the denying of all ungodliness and worldly lust, that we should live soberly, and godly, in the present world."

Relly.

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor,—Observing in your useful paper, the interrogations over the signature of Philotheus, I have thought proper to answer some of his interrogatories, and, at the same time, give a few extracts taken from Mr. Evans' sketch, in order to show to what height faniticism may rise; and yet it may be possible, in many instances, its votaries are sincere. It may be said, that these extracts have no connexion with the interrogations of Philotheus, true, they have not; but I think they have something to do with Philotheus, who it is to be presumed, is a disciple of Emanuel Swedenborg, whose followers, now are better known by the name of New Jerusalemites. Philotheus says, "he cannot believe in the doctrine that Jesus saved all men about 1800 years ago, so completely, that a second salvation by a birth of Jesus Christ in every individual is unnecessary. For I read, "Ye must be born again," &c. If Philotheus means, by a birth of Jesus Christ in every individual, the knowledge of salvation by Jesus Christ, wrought out by him for every individual, as necessary to make every individual happy, or a salvation from misery, which is the consequence of the belief of the truth, which truth is, that we are saved, no impediment will be laid in his way by any "Rellyan,"—but if Philotheus means by *a birth of* Jesus Christ *in* every individual, the *birth* of *a* Christ *in* every individual, we must object to such an idea, as we do not believe in transubstantiation. Philotheus says, "Obey the Gospel, or expect the wrath of God." What gospel shall we obey? We read of lords many, and we read of gods many, and hear of gospels many. Shall we believe and obey the gospel of God our Saviour, which is "glad tidings of great joy, and which shall be to all people?" This would be believing in the salvation of all,—and Philotheus asks, "If all, or if any man fully believed this doctrine, I ask, what would prevent him or them from stealing, robbing, or murdering, to promote his, or their pleasures, increase his, or their riches, or advance his, or their glory?" I would ask Philotheus, what prevents him from the commission of all the above crimes which he enumerates? Is it because he believes in *the heart-withering doctrine of eternal torment?* If so, certainly society is benefited by Philotheus being under a delusion, and I would be the last one to undeceive him, if I thought he would sally forth upon the property and lives of his fellow creatures, as before intimated. Philotheus' happiness must be very much circumscribed, seeing he is prevented from gratifying himself by committing robbery, and murder. If the crimes which Philotheus enumerates, will promote happiness, pleasures, riches and glory, as he says, in this life, why not in the next? And if virtue is connected with misery in this life, why not in the next?—And if that should be the case, Philotheus is labouring and toiling in virtue, for even *less* than "a penny a day." Philotheus says, "No murderer hath eternal life abiding *in* him." Very true,—and what is the reason that he has not? "He that hateth his brother is a murderer;" the very circumstance of his *hating* his brother demonstrates, that he hath not the knowledge of eternal life,—he is disposed to rob and

murder his brother; but when he comes to the knowledge of the *first* salvation mentioned by Philotheus, he will also see the salvation of his brother, and consequently, be saved from the evil desires which he exercised towards his brother. Philotheus observes, "the *first* birth is in sin." Is this the natural birth which is meant? If so, the *first* birth is accompanied with *sin*; then, as Philotheus observes, we are, or were in the "old Adam, Antichrist, or Satan." Probably, he has had part of this text in view,—"As we have borne the image of the *earthy*, (that is Adam) we shall also bear the image of the *heavenly*," (that is Christ.) The latter part of this text, it is presumed, escaped his notice; therefore, Philotheus appears to reason thus: We are all born *by* the *first* birth *in sin*; consequently, of the synagogue of Satan,—but *if* implies a condition, therefore, "If ye die *in* your *sins*, where I am, ye *cannot* come." Philotheus, where are those little children which have died in the same sins that they were brought forth with? Probably, Philotheus will say, he (that is Christ) was manifested to take away our sins,—very good. I ask, will he perform that, for which he was manifested? But Philotheus says, "*if* implies a condition." If *so*, *how* do *you* know but the *condition was performed?* Philotheus will please to hear the Baptist.—"Behold the Lamb of God, who *taketh away the sin of the world.*" Will you presume to say, that God was not in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses? And when the Saviour said unto the Jews, "If ye die in your sins, where I am, ye cannot come," he had reference to his death; for proof of this, the Saviour says, "If I am lifted up, I will draw all men unto me." The *if* in Philotheus' condition is to perform. Therefore, "God will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." What truth? The truth that they are saved. Saved by whom? By him who "tasted death for every man." Philotheus must not stagger at the promises of God through unbelief, for he who hath promised, will not he perform? Yea, verily, he will, for "all flesh shall see the salvation of God." Philotheus says, "Some men, and some women, are of the synagogue of Satan. Is Christ the Head of these unholy deceivers and liars?" I will ask Philotheus, who was at the head when Christ led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men, yea, even unto the rebellious, that God the Lord might dwell among them." This appears, as though his Satanic magesty's synagogue had been moved from its foundation. You must not be alarmed, "If death, and he that has the power of death, that is the devil,(or Satan) should be destroyed; and they be delivered, who were all their lifetime subject to bondage through fear of death." All this has been done, for the unholy, as you are pleased to call them. Philotheus, the "whole need no physician, but those that are sick." This medicine is for the healing of the nations; the efficacy of the same is declared, "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, and glorify thy name." I shall, now, make a few extracts from Mr. Evans' sketch, &c. page 296, "he (that is Emanuel Swedenborg,) asserts, that in the year 1743 the Lord manifested himself to him in a personal appearance, and at the same time, opened his spiritual eyes, so that he was enabled, constantly to see, and converse with spirits and angels." An excellent beginning. "But they shall come with all lying wonders." Page 297, "As often as I conversed with angels face to face, *it was* in their habitation, &c. No doubt, as *often* as *he* conversed with them, so and so, was the case, but how often did *you* converse with them? It puts me in mind of an observation I once heard made by a person in this city, "That he would not believe a falsehood, if he told it himself." Speaking of the science of correspondences, page 298, "This Science of correspondences (it is said) had been *lost* for some thousands of years, even since the time of Job, but now is revived by Emanuel Swedenborg." So it would appear, that the prophets, Christ, and his apostles, did *not understand* the spiritual meaning of the Scriptures. Page 302, he says, "I converse freely, and am in friendship with all the bishops of my country, which are ten in number, and also with the sixteen senators, and the rest of *the grandees*, who love and honour me, as knowing, that I am in fellowship with angels." The Baron does not tell how they knew he was in fellowship with angels; but I will take it for granted, he told them it was the case. Christ and his apostles were persecuted from city to city, on account of the doctrine which they taught; and the Baron was *esteemed* by the *bishops*, the *nobles*, and the *rest* of the *grandees*.—Certainly he must have been a great favourite of the celestial world.

To conclude,—The account which Baron Swedenborg gives of himself, is too ridiculous to be entitled to the least credit; and every person who believes his *vagaries*, and denies the account of the "Salvation of all men by Jesus Christ," which God spoke by the mouth of all *his* holy prophets and apostles, is an illustrative and excellent comment on the words of Christ,—"*Gape* at a *gnat*, and *swallow* a *camel!*"

A. Rellyan.

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor,—The following declaration of Dr. Doddridge, I have extracted from Evans' sketch of all denominations. It appears to be almost an unqualified denial of the errors of Calvinism; and what appeared to him to be the *most* incredible, will, at a period not far distant, not only appear so to men generally, but he who would dare to charge the God of the whole earth with such an act, will be considered a fit subject for the Lunatic Hospital.

J. B.

The Author says, Dr. Doddridge has this striking remark,—"That a being who is said, not to tempt any one, and even swears that he desires not the death of a sinner, should *irresistibly determine* millions to the commission of every sinful action of their lives, and then, with all the pomp and pageantry of an universal judgment, condemn them to eternal misery on account of these actions, that hereby he may promote the happiness of others, who are, or shall be, irresistibly determined to virtue, in the like manner, is, of all incredible things, to me the most incredible!"

To the Editor and Readers of the Gospel Herald.

I have been examining the 1st chap. of Matthew, and third of Luke, in which the genealogy of our Saviour is given; and I must confess, that I find myself totally unable to understand it. There is certainly something very singular in these accounts. In them both, we have laid before us the lineage of Joseph. Now, as Joseph was not the real father of Jesus, how can his generation be called the generation of Jesus Christ? And farther, I find but little agreement between these two accounts. Matthew traces the lineage of Joseph as far back as Abraham. Luke goes back as far as Adam. I shall begin my comparison with Matthew's genealogical account at Abraham. From Abraham to David inclusive, we find that Matthew and Luke agree; but, strange to tell, they come together no more until they meet in the person of Joseph, the husband of Mary. And even here is an apparent discrepancy, for according to Matthew, Joseph is the son of Jacob; but according to Luke, he is the son of Heli. Between David and Joseph, Matthew mentions twenty-five generations, but Luke tells us of forty, and nearly all different. You will find them as follows.

Matthew's account.	Luke's account.
David	*David*
Solomon	*Nathan*
Roboam	*Mattatha*
Abia	*Minan*
Asa	*Melea*
Josaphat	*Eliakim*
Joram	*Jonan*
Ozias	*Joseph*
Joatham	*Juda*
Achaz	*Simeon*
Ezekias	*Levi*
Manasses	*Matthal*
Amon	*Jorim*
Josias	*Eliezer*
Jechonias	*Jose*
Salathiel	*Er*
Zorobabel	*Elmodam*
Abiud	*Cosam*
Eliakim	*Addi*
Azor	*Melchi*
Sadoc	*Neri*
Achim	*Salathiel*
Eliud	*Zorobabel*
Eleazer	*Rhesa*
Matthan	*Joanna*
Jacob	*Juda*
Joseph	*Joseph*
	Semei
	Mattathias
	Maath
	Nagge
	Esli
	Naum
	Amos
	Mattathias
	Joseph
	Janna
	Melchi
	Levi
	Matthat
	Heli
	Joseph

Now, Sir, as I fully believe, that Matthew and Luke wrote by Divine, Inspiration, I feel confident that there must be some recondite, and important instruction contained in these accounts, which are not discernible in the letter alone. I do, therefore, sincerely and earnestly request you, or some of your correspondents, or any person who is capable, to come forward and explain this important but intricate subject.

Pothos.

Note.—As our correspondent has addressed his communication to our readers generally, and his request for an explanation, being general likewise, the subject is open for future discussion for our correspondents, or any other person, &c.

Consequence of Calvinism.

A few years since, Calvinists were bold enough to acknowledge the conclusions which resulted from their premises. Times, however, have altered; and Calvinists have altered with the times. It is only here and there, and once in a great while, that a Calvinist will muster courage, and tell all he believes. And when he does declare, what he considers to be the *whole* counsel of God, he declares, that infants will be endlessly miserable. We think it is not uncharitable to suppose, that this declaration would be made much more frequently, were it not for *fear* of *offending* congregations, and *jeopardizing salaries*. This abominable doctrine is preached in *fact*, by all Calvinists now; and would be preached in *form*, but for the reasons above assigned. They declare, that without *faith* in the Lord Jesus Christ, and *sincere contrition* for *actual*, as well as *original* sin, and all this, in this life, there is no *possibility* of salvation. Now, it is evident, to every man, that no *infant can have this faith*, or contrition. Consequently, they are by these judges, consigned to endless burnings. And it is nothing more nor less, than *prevarication* and *falsehood*, to *contend* for *premises*, and *deny* their *conclusions*. Calvinism, therefore, is *even*, in the *opinion* of its *advocates*, too abominably disgraceful and infamous to be *fully* confessed; and it is a kind of *negative* compliment, to tell them, that *they* themselves are *ashamed of it!*

Note,—The celebrated Dr. Watts expressed the following sentiment relative to *infants*. He gave it as his opinion, that *infants* did not commit *actual* transgression; consequently, could not be punished in a future state for *their* sins. Christ had atoned for the original sin of Adam; consequently, they could not be accountable for that. Infants were not believers, for they never heard of a Saviour, and could not therefore, have faith,—consequently could

not inherit heaven. They were not unbelievers, for they never *denied*, or refused their assent to the truth, for they never heard it,—consequently, could not come into condemnation. They, therefore, neither *deserve hell*, nor *merit* heaven,—consequently they *might* be annihilated! So much for ERROR!

REVIEW OF THE REV. MR. M'CLELLAND'S SERMON.

(*Concluded from page* 64.)

The ground of reasoning adopted by our Rev. Author, is, perhaps, almost without a parallel; if we take into consideration his principles, the influence which they ought at all times to have in governing his conclusions, and the only apparent or justifiable cause, which in this instance could operate as a motive sufficiently powerful to induce him to act counter to, and deny them. We say, the *only* apparent, or justifiable cause, and we appeal to the reader, whether there is another cause assigned by our Rev. Author, but *a noble frenzy;* and whether the *fervour of their benevolence*, is not rather the *effect* of the *noble frenzy*, than *vice versa*. We think on the whole, that our investigation of the *effects*, by an examination of the data furnished us, and which is contained in their *exhibit* of their appropriations, and the several sums given by large congregations, "clothed like princes," will prove, that they must *indeed* have been seized with a *noble*, or an *ignoble frenzy*, believing, as they pretended to believe, "That the glory of God, and the salvation of eight hundred millions of their *brethren* were at stake, (see page 14,) and only give altogether, all this great assemblage of people, who were clothed like princes, to *give only* 153 dollars to save them from *endless torments*, and the glory of God, which they pretend is so very dear to them, *from being lost*,—and this too, when "they *actually* cherished the idea," that they could save them, and that "every dollar and every cent would *go far* to save some *poor soul* from *death!*" Under such circumstances, a *plea* of *insanity*, is, in our opinion, absolutely necessary to justify their conduct in any shape whatever. And, it is charitable to suppose, that our Rev. Author, having an eye to the result, pronounced them "*seized* with a (noble) frenzy," and this *if true*, is in our opinion a sufficient excuse, for their not giving of their abundance, at least, a *sum* which should *bear* a *shadow* of *comparison* with the importance of the object to be obtained! What should we say of the man, who "clothed like a prince," and rioting in abundance, would not *give* 1000 dollars to save the life or limb of a fellow creature, of one whom he professed to regard as his brother? The whole world would cry shame upon the man,—out upon him,—he is a barbarian! What should we say of 500 men, who are "clothed like princes," and in possession of millions of dollars, who declare they believe, that "A thousand millions of souls are perishing," that "they are living *without enjoyment*, dying *without hope*, and day by day, peopling the receptacle of the lost," and altogether contribute only 153 dollars to save them from never-ending misery and despair? And this insensibility persisted in, notwithstanding they are informed, and they even pretend to believe it too, "that every dollar and cent would go far to save some poor soul from death,"—nay more,—they are asked, "Is there a heart in this assembly that does not throb at the agonizing reflection, and *would* NOT *give a thousand worlds* to escape from the conviction that it is the sober truth!!! Quere. Would a man be likely to give a *thousand worlds* if he had them, to procure that, which he is told every dollar and cent will go far to procure, and who concludes, on the whole, that it is best to keep his dollars? Are dollars worth more than worlds? Would it not be reasonable to suppose they were, when they are even considered of greater value than souls?

Our Rev. Author, in his 32d page, relative to the time of God's fulfilling his promise, says, "Do you ask, then, when is the time? I answer, *now*,—when his people have awaked to a sense of their *responsibility*, are combining their energies, are pressing round the throne of his grace, to PUT HIM IN REMEMBRANCE," &c. It appears, that the responsibility, spoken of, is the obligation which the New-York Missionary Society owe to God, "to *put him in remembrance!!!*" It would seem, God had FORGOTTEN!!! Our Rev. Author adds, "had such a spirit (a frenzy) prevailed in the church, the promise would have been fulfilled ages since!" In the next, the 33d page, this is reiterated. "He has made its accomplishment DEPEND upon his church; and YOU are a *part* of that highly privileged community," &c. There is an *old book* called the Bible, which we have seen, and which we are pretty positive declares, "That God's counsel shall stand, and HE (not, according to our recollection, the New-York Missionary Society) will do all his pleasure." And we think, that the God spoken of in that Bible, did not want to be *put in remembrance*. There was one Baal, an idol, whose worshippers cried out in a loud voice, with a view to *wake him up*, for they thought he was asleep, &c. It looks, at least, likely, that our Rev. Author has some such imaginary deity, or we think he would not find it necessary to imitate their conduct. There is a striking similarity in the fact stated, that he depended upon his worshippers, instead of his worshippers depending upon him. Our Rev. Author says, "If I do not grossly err, heaven is expecting much from you, my hearers," &c. Quere. Do facts justify the conclusion, that heaven will not be disappointed. In the 35th page, speaking of those employed, &c. he says, "It is to them a most painful reflection, that though Providence is opening a door of usefulness, which has *never been opened before*, they are *utterly unable* to improve the golden opportunity." Now talk of "heaven depending, and expecting,—of noble frenzies,—of actually cherishing ideas,—of the spirit of the age,—of being above all praise! Look at the "account current,"—see the effects of this "*frenzy*,—the fruits of this *spirit*,—the "motive which is above all praise"—A large congregation, "actually cherishing the idea of emancipating the world,—seized with a NOBLE FRENZY,—inspired with a spirit, whose motives are above all praise,—whose hearts throb with *agony*, and who would give worlds to escape from a conviction of the truth of the deplorable state of their brethren, who by thousands of millions are perishing,—and when every dollar, and every cent, would go far to save some of them," give,—how much?—SIX DOLLARS!!! Another congregation "seized with this noble frenzy," gave seventeen. And the first mentioned congregation, at another time, when this spirit moved them to a noble frenzy, gave nine dollars. Reader, these are fruits of the spirit of the age. Here are accounts of large assemblages of people professing to believe that every dollar and cent would go far to save some poor soul from never-ending misery, and with this profession in their mouths, not give of their abundance, a sum equal to six pence per head, to *save* their BRETHREN from being ROASTED FOR EVER! Shame on such a spirit! The God we worship, gave his only begotten Son!* This *spirit* would not give *six pence!*

"*And we have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.*"—*1st Epistle John*, iv. 14.

It is very common for professors of Christianity, to talk much of the will, purpose, and decrees of God. They speak of God, as having a purpose, or plan, which they say is his pleasure, and which *must* be accomplished. On this subject we believe there is no diversity of opinion. Here all *unite*. But open your Bible, declare, in the words of *inspiration* itself, what that purpose, or plan, or pleasure is, and you are immediately warred against by thousands. Is it not astonishing, that men can be found, who will believe that God has a *plan*, or *purpose*, and that this *plan* is his *pleasure*, and believe this on the authority of the Bible, and at the same time *deny* the testimony of the *same* authority, relative to what that plan, or purpose, or pleasure is? It is astonishing. This conduct, to say the least, is perfectly absurd. What should we say of a judge, or jury, who would admit one half of the testimony of a witness as truth, and deny, or disbelieve the remainder? We should say, they acted like idiots or crazy men, and were unfit to be trusted with the lives, property, or reputation of any person whatever! Now, this is precisely the conduct of religious professors. We even appeal to their *own* consciences for the truth of our declaration, and they know, they cannot deny it. Their conversation and opinions, expressed every day of their lives, bears testimony against them; nay more,—heaven and earth, the oath of Jehovah, the declaration of all his prophets and apostles, and the declarations of Jesus the anointed of God, and their own confessions and premises, arise in judgment against them; and still, they wilfully persist in *error!* God, say they, will do all his pleasure,—the Scriptures declare, that it is "his pleasure, in the fulness of times, to gather all things in heaven and in earth, in Christ, even in him." They *deny* it. God, say they, will effect his purpose,—The Scriptures declare, that God hath purposed in himself to gather all in Christ! They deny it, and declare, it will never be done! God, say they, worketh *all* things after the counsel of his own will; the Scriptures declare, that "God sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world;" they declare, that the world will never be saved; in other words, God will never be able to effect his purpose; his pleasure shall never be done,—his plans shall never be accomplished,—his decrees shall fail of having effect, and JEHOVAH be DISAPPOINTED! We ask these unbelievers, to come forward like honest men, and either *deny* these *premises*, or *support*, by *reason*, or *Scripture*, or *common sense*, their conclusions. Let them, at least, show something which looks a little like consistency. They have prevaricated and twisted long enough. All nature cries out against them,—and their consciences, if they are not completely suffocated with their absurd and wicked unbelief and folly, will cry out too!

* Note.—Is not this Spirit above all praise?

Good old Doctrine.

PSALM LXXXV. 4th verse to the end. "*Turn us, O God of our salvation, and cause thine anger toward us to cease. Wilt thou be angry with us for ever? Wilt thou draw out thine anger to all generations? Wilt thou not receive us again, that thy people may rejoice in thee? Shew us thy mercy, O Lord, and grant us thy salvation. I will hear what God the Lord will speak: for he will speak peace unto his people, and to his saints; but let them not turn again to folly. Surely his salvation is nigh them that fear him; that glory may dwell in our land. Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth shall spring out of the earth; and righteousness shall look down from heaven. Yea, the Lord shall give that which is good; and our land shall yield her increase. Righteousness shall go before him, and shall set us in the way of his steps.*

There are some things worthy of special notice in this Psalm. *God is to turn us;* God is to *show us* salvation, and *speak peace*. Truth shall, *not may*, spring out of the earth; the Lord shall, *not may*, give good. Righteousness shall, *not may, or can*, go before him; and shall, *not may*, set *us* in the way of his steps. We believe it would require something more than *sharp eyes* to find the "personal holiness of the creature" here! or, point out one condition!

To Correspondents.

Halcyon, in answer to Mikross, is received, and will appear in our next. Philotheus is received, and will be published next week.

NOTICE.

Those persons who reside at, or in the vicinity of Norwalk, Conn. who wish to become subscribers to this paper, are informed, that Mr. Noah S Bailey, of Norwalk, will receive subscriptions, and supply them with the Numbers from the commencement &c

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1820. NO. 21.

CONTROVERSIAL.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor,—I observed in the Gospel Herald of August 26th, a communication over the signature of Mikross, which states, that the communication of Halcyon, or that part thereof, which says, that "A religious life has generally been considered by those that are called orthodox, to be compounded of alternate scenes of doubt, of gloomy melancholy, and the reviving rays of returning hope," needs explanation, at least, if it does not require to be materially corrected. I shall, therefore, with peculiar pleasure, notice before the public the remarks that Mikross has made, relative to the preceding part of my communication. For my own part, I do not conceive that it needs any illustration; for it literally means what it says,—neither do I conceive, that it requires to be corrected; for it speaks the truth, and is, therefore, a correct statement of facts. Mikross next observes, that he "has read many standard authors on this very subject, who were styled orthodox, without learning that any one of them considered a religious life the compound that I have described. That he never suspected that any, even of the more ignorant class of private Christians, conceived such an idea of it, until the above statement met his eye." He farther observes, that "if I can substantiate this statement, the public are entitled to the proof; and if I cannot, he submits it to myself, whether a strict regard to charity and Christian candour, would not urge me to correct it." To this I answer, that I am always willing to correct and acknowledge to the world my errors, as soon as I am convinced of them. But so far from being in error on the present occasion, I stand surrounded with superabundant evidence to prove the correctness of this (to Mikross) objectionable statement. And, if I had not been in possession of the strongest evidence of the fact, I should never have been the means of presenting it to the public. As Mikross observes, that he has read many standard authors on this subject, and has found no such description of it, as I have represented, I am disposed to think, that he must have given the writings of those authors a very superficial reading indeed, not to have discovered, that they agree precisely with the statement I have made. For I have never read any of those self-styled orthodox writers on this subject, who differed from the views I have given of it. I shall, therefore, in the first place, produce quotations from their own writings to prove the fact, as stated by me. And first,—John Witherspoon, D.D. and late President of the New Jersey College, in a sermon written by him, which is contained in a book called the American Preacher, states as follows, page 206, that, "Surely the excellent ones of the earth may be sometimes involved in great perplexity and doubt." Page 207, (speaking of hope in the Divine favour) "If this, from the variableness of our own conduct, is sometimes more, sometimes less strong, and sometimes wholly suspended; when this last is the case, it must occasion inexpressible concern." And again he observes, "how many do we see every day under a spirit of bondage, who, though they still cleave to God as their portion, yet are often full of fears, and seldom dare confidently affirm their interest in, or relation to him." "And indeed, (he continues) how can it be otherwise? While we are here, our sanctification is but imperfect; and alas! with regard to many, it is often hard to determine, whether we should not write upon it, Mene tekel, as essentially defective." Page 208, in consequence of a rebellious heart, &c. Christians alternately are calling in question the certainty, either of the love of God to them, or of their love to him."

Philip Doddridge, D.D. in his book entitled the Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul, page 318, speaking of the grand adversary of man, observes, that "he will follow him with malicious arts and pursuits to the very end of his pilgrimage; and that he will leave no method unattempted which may be likely to weaken his hands, and to sadden his heart; that if through the gracious interposition of God, he cannot prevent his final happiness, he may, at least, impair his peace and his usefulness as he is passing to it. This (says Mr. Doddridge) is what the people of God feel; and what you feel in some degree or other, if you have your lot and portion among them." In the 2d volume of the New-York Missionary Magazine of 1801, it is written, as follows, concerning the conflict between sin and grace. Page 139, "While they strive for the mastery, the soul of the believer experiences strange alterations. Now, in the exercise of faith on the Lord Jesus Christ, he is more than a conqueror; the power of corruption seems to be destroyed; his mountain stands strong; and he is ready to say, I shall never be moved. In one hour the scene is reversed; therefore, whom he thought dead, awakens as a giant refreshed from sleep. A thousand furious lusts break in upon his repose, and fill him with consternation and dismay. Again he is victorious through grace, and again the enemy returns to the charge. In this manner must he fight his way through, often conquering, often foiled, till the last great triumph, in which he shall enter the everlasting kingdom of his Lord and Saviour."

In complete union with all this testimony, the celebrated Watts declares,

> By glimmering hopes and gloomy fears,
> We trace the sacred road;
> Through dismal deeps and dangerous snares,
> We make our way to God.

Numerous other quotations might be made to the same effect, but those that are already made may suffice. I now think it is the duty of Mikross, either to point out the difference between the foregoing extracts and the compound which he considered essentially wrong, or to acknowledge, that they amount to the same in substance. But in addition to all this testimony, many of the consecrated desks in this city, even at the present day, can bear witness to the same Doctrines. And I now appeal to the consciences of all those, from the Bishops down to the most ignorant of professing Christians, who believe in any thing short of an effectual, finished, Universal salvation, whether their path through life is not diversified with alternate scenes, in a greater or less degree, of brightened prospects for future bliss, and dark and gloomy uncertainty. And in a special and particular manner, I appeal to the conscience of Mikross, (if he is a professor of religion,) whether he has not experienced in his own mind something very like hope and fear, relative to his final salvation. If he has not, by inference from the extract from Dr. Doddridge, he has neither lot nor portion among the people of God. And also, according to President Witherspoon, these changes are certain and cannot be avoided. These eminent authors, in this, are certainly correct; for by their systems no person can ever have while here, the perfect assurance of happiness beyond the grave, and their hopes, and their fears, on this subject, will always be in proportion to their virtue, to their own internal goodness, and to their ignorance of that testimony, which says, that "he that transgresseth the law in one point, is guilty of all; that God taketh cognizance of the thoughts of the heart, and hath said, Thou shalt not covet." May the Almighty soon remove the veil of the covering which tradition has cast over the minds of the people, and introduce them into the rest of the believer, which is far beyond the sphere of gloomy melancholy or doubt.

Halcyon.

For the Gospel Herald.

The Editor, in his last answer to Philotheus, presumes without proof.—*First*, that *all men* are *in Christ;* because the writers of the Scriptures have, in writing to the saints, said, "In God we live and move, and have our being:" or we are complete in him, who is the head of all principality, &c., or other such passages. Thus he applies to sinners, what is applicable to saints. Sinners are such as are not in Christ, agreeably to John, xv. 6, and viii. 44. Acts xiii. 10 John xvi. 33. In Christ is peace, in the world is tribulation. All, therefore, who are not in peace, and in the unity of the Spirit, which Paul said was the bond of peace, are not in Christ, but are in the world of tribulation. *Secondly*, Although most of the world of mankind are in tribulation, yet he infers that all are in a state of blessedness, because the *oath* of God was, "that in Christ the seed of Abraham, all the nations of the earth shall be blessed." Gen. xxii. 18. But this simply amounts to no more than that all the nations of the earth *shall be* blessed in Christ, the seed of Abraham, according to the flesh, but of God according to the Spirit. But when? Are all the nations of the earth *now* blessed in Christ? If so, they are not in trouble, &c. but in a blessed condition. The Editor says, all persons are in Christ, and so in the state of blessedness Others say, they are not; "for the wicked are like the troubled sea;" for multitudes are not in the Spirit, but in the flesh; are not in Christ Jesus, but out of him; are not in God's approbation, but in his reprobation. They that walk after the flesh are ungodly: and Paul says, Rom. viii. 8. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, doth not make such, as it made Paul, *free* from the law of sin and death. But to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, no condemnation exists, Rom. viii. 1. For the law of the Holy Spirit *freed* them from sin, condemnation and death, and they walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, and please God. They who abide not in Christ the vine, John xv. and are out of him; they who are in the flesh, in Adam, Cain, Esau, Hagar, Ishmael, which are the carnal natures, and are carnally minded, these are not subject to the law of God, agreeably to Rom. viii. 6. 7. This may serve to manifest that all are not in Jesus Christ; neither all men, nor all nations, and so not in Christian beatitudes. Though many are called to him by the Spirit, that speaks to churches," Rev. yet few heed and obey its voice, and, consequently, few are chosen. This agrees with the words of Christ, "that many are called, but few are chosen." Those Corinthians who had made their calling and election sure, by the grace of God, and a right use of their free-agency, are called "the temples of the living God." 2d Cor. vi. 16. God dwelleth in his temple, "or God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them." "Know ye not that ye are the *temple* of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. iii. 16. Here we see that the people of Corinth who were "sanctified in Christ Jesus," chap. i v. 2. form the temple of God, and "the temple of God is holy," 1 Cor. iii 17 "which temple ye are." Here is a plain proof that the Editor is wrong, when he makes holy souls of the holy temple of God, to be sinners, not saints. Because the Scriptures say, of the "world which lieth in wickedness," that not one of the worldly class of society is good: that all have sinned, &c., he falsely concludes, that the children, church and temple of God, is unholy, even that every soul abiding in their bodies here, and

composing the holy temple of God, in which God dwells by his Spirit, and which Spirit sanctifies them. Awful perversion of the true sense of Scripture! and defiling of mind in the temple of God, "and if any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy." Let the defying Goliah, who scoffs at the regeneration of sinners, to fit them for God's holy temple, dread the consequence. Though the souls that compose the holy temple of God are holy, and God dwelleth in them, yet their holiness is *wholly* of God, from whom only cometh every good. So that, in this sense of reference to the source of all good, it is said, to such as suppose man has any good of himself, and not of God, "*there is none good but God.*" This appears evidently the real signification of this passage. But not so, in some's opinion. The Editor wrests this text, to prove that every member of the temple and church of God is wicked, as long as he dwells in an outward body. He thus makes the temple and church of God unholy! and thus makes the body of Christ unholy; "for the church is the body of Christ." I am sorry for his dangerous blindness, and have trembled for the danger into which he was leading his readers. I queried, because I wished no unpleasant controversy about tenets. The Scriptures are wrested into too many opposing sentiments, to suit sectarian spirits, *heretic*ising from the Spirit that gave, and the only thing that can truly expound the Scriptures. "For the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." 1 Cor. ii. 11. If we explain this text, as the Editor has the text, "*there is none good but God,*" then it follows that all mankind, without exception, know nothing of the things of God Why then do any venture to preach? Why then does the Editor write and mislead from God, who has promised to teach us himself by his Spirit? They who are washed from their sins, though they were as crimson and scarlet, are white and holy; they that are united to God, agreeable to what is said, John xvii. 20. &c. participate of the divine nature, 2 Pet i. 4, and of his holiness, Heb. xii. 10. They are partakers of Christ, Heb. iii. 14. and of the Holy Ghost, vi. 4. In this way, men and women are rendered divine, holy, Christian and spiritual. Sinners are not of the church of Christ, but the synagogue of Satan, Apocalypse, chap. 2 v. 9. They are unholy, belonging to an unholy church, and an unholy head, Satan. "They are of their father the devil, whose works they do." John viii 44. Will the Editor with Relly, unite holiness with unholiness; and make Christ to have concord with Belial? For he holds all and every one of mankind, sinners and saints, are in Christ; and that Christ is the head, even of every wicked man. If so, who is head of the synagogue of Satan? Is Satan and Christ the same being? "And are all the individuals and nations, and families of the earth in Christ, saved in him, and blessed in him? That all who are in him, are saved are washed from their sins, and find rest, I believe; but I do not believe that every man is in him; nor that he is in every man. They in whom he is not, are reprobates, and reprobated, according to the Scriptures of truth. The strong man armed, even Satan is in such; and none but Christ, the stronger, can cast him out and spoil his goods. I do not believe the oath, which the Editor mentions so exultingly, as signifying all are in Christ; and all, saints and sinners, are saved and blessed. For if this was a true exposition of the text, all would be saved from sins; for Jesus came to save from sin, and "purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of *good* works," and consequently all would be holy, good, and wise, and belong to his holy temple, and there could be no synagogue of Satan, no strong man, (Satan) in man's soul to be expelled; no new birth necessary. Beloved readers, I feel interested for your eternal welfare; and wish you "to make your calling" effectual; I wish you to attend to the calls of the Holy Spirit, which speaks truth; John, xiv 17. convinces sinners of sin, and leads into Christ, in whom only is salvation. For the Gospel dispensation is a ministration of the Spirit, 2 Cor. iii. 6. &c.

The Editor's observation on my note, p. 76. is an *ipse dixit*, unsubstantiated; and even contradictory to the quotation in the note taken from Paul; who exhorts to "work out your own salvation, with fear and trembling." And then Paul, to show whence the power of working is derived, adds, "For it is God that worketh in you, both to will and work." To God therefore, is all the glory, though man, as a free-agent, rendered again so, since his fall, by grace, is to choose the Lord for his portion, is to seek first the kingdom of heaven in preference to every thing else, and to work out his own salvation, by uniting and co-operating with the Spirit and grace of God, which is the source and author of faith, works, and salvation in the creature. As we are to work out our salvation *now*, it is evident that salvation is *still* to be worked out, and that regeneration does *still* continue to be necessary. Consequently, the first part of salvation is what Jesus has done, and does still wholly without us; Isaiah lix. 16. "And he saw there was no man, and wondered there was no intercessor; therefore, his arm brought salvation, and his righteousness sustained him. For he put on righteousness as a breast-plate, and a helmet of salvation upon his head." By the first part of the salvation of souls, all men are put into a *salvable* condition. Christ, the light, the gospel; the power of God descended and descends to men for their salvation. And whenever it now descends, and manifests its light and power, then is the time for the second part of salvation to proceed. Then is the time we have power to co-operate, and "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling; because it is God who worketh in us, both to will and do of his own good pleasure." If the Editor has no experimental knowledge of this second and essential part that ensures our calling and election, no wonder he discards this, and depends wholly on the first, and on what Jesus Christ did, when he suffered and died for us. If the new birth is not this second part of salvation, but is what the Editor affirms it to be, *to wit*, "a creation of all men anew in Christ Jesus about 1800 years ago;" "and that what appears to Philotheus to be the new birth, is nothing more than coming to the *knowledge* of the truth, that he (*Philotheus and every human being*) *is* "created anew in Christ Jesus," (I suppose he means, was created anew in him, 1800 years ago, before the present thousand millions inhabitants of this world existed) then I think it may be proved, that Paul improperly commanded and exhorted us "to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling," for it was worked out, perfected, and completed long ago, long before our first birth, long before our existence. Why, therefore, should we quake and tremble. The way of salvation is broad and sure; though Christ declared, that narrow and strait is the way and gate that leads to life; and that many would seek to enter the kingdom of heaven without striving as they ought to, and so, would not be able. According to the Editor, Paul should not have said, "For it is God that worketh in you, &c." but he should have said, "For God hath saved you, Cain, Nero, Robertspiere, and all men *completely*, when Jesus died on the cross." For this salvation being complete, no man need to work out his salvation now; nor strive to enter in at the strait gate, or walk the narrow way. For all being in Christ, (see p. 77. column 1.) circumcised when Jesus was circumcised, quickened, baptized, buried, &c., when Jesus was, for such I understand to be the Editor's belief and exposition of the Scripture; consequently, all, according to the Editor, were made, what he too sneeringly calls white sons, 1800 years ago! He also believes expressly, that all died, (before they existed) in Adam and Eve, about 6000 years ago; and made alive again in Christ, about 1800 years ago. If his belief, expressed in the last sentence, be consonant to the truth, our fall and death in Adam, and our rising and re-animation in Christ, were wholly inconsistent to the Editor's belief *in free-agency* and free-will. Yet he professes to believe in free-agency. Such are the contradictory propositions and tenets of the Editor; I note them, that he may see how to correct himself, and reform; and that he may write with more modesty and humility. I write with good will.

The Editor gives notice as follows: "If Philotheus should ever send another communication for this paper, he must, to satisfy the Editor and our readers, (at least nine out of ten of them) answer the following question, namely, how can the declarations of Christ and his apostle be truth, except the world was saved by Christ, 1800 years ago? Christ said, "*he came to save the world;** *and finished the work the Father gave him to do.*" And Paul said (to the "saints and faithful brethren in Christ at Colosse," chap. i. v. 2.) "we are complete in Christ." Philotheus agrees with this; and if saints are in Christ, and complete in him, they are perfect and holy. But sinners are incomplete who are not in him; and who have Satan, (not Christ) for their head. The saints of Colosse, and not the sinners, were circumcised with the circumcision made without hands. As Jesus was circumcised on the eighth day without hands, it follows, that the one *with hands* is here not referred to by Paul, and that circumcision and baptism, &c., here mentioned, related to the new birth, in which circumcision, baptism, quickening, and resurrection, are essentially necessary, and these things are as necessary *now*, to change sinners into saints, as ever they were. A new birth with all its requisites is essentially necessary; agreeably to the words of Christ, "Ye must be born again:" born of the Spirit, &c., and when we are so born, *we are quickened together with Christ*, as the 2d chap. of Colossians, on which I now expound, declares, and all saints have had their sins forgiven, when born again; and were not forgiven 1800 years ago, as the Editor argues and expounds here; applying to sinners and all the world, what Paul here spoke, merely, "*to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ at Colosse.*"

I am accused severely, for not controverting the arguments of the Editor. I own, I now do it with reluctance, though I see no great difficulty in controverting them. "We expect," says the Editor, that Philotheus will "either acknowledge that he believes the Scriptures to be *truth* (true) or confess his *infidelity,—down with his FALSE colours*, and prove to the world, that he is an *honest* and courageous man." My dear readers, do *I deserve* all this? I believe the Scriptures of Moses, the prophets, evangelists, and apostles, to be true; I quote them, but because I have avoided controversial examinations of all the misapplied and mal-expounded Scriptures, his active head brings forward; I am accused of *trifling* with the Scriptures, &c. It is with regret I am thus urged to write; and hope the public will excuse me. I will now *proceed*. I have been SEARCHING *without success* to find the expressions, that Jesus Christ said he came "*to save the world.*" In John iii. 16. Christ says, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* in him should not *perish*, &c. v. 17. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world *through him might be saved.*" "Might be saved," is in the subjunctive, or conditional mood; and has reference to the condition, in 16th verse, of believing on him. 18th verse, "He that believeth not on him, is condemned," &c., and must *perish*, agreeably to the tenor of Christ's discourse there. So that his salvation of the world is *conditional* Mat. xv. 24. He says, "I am not sent *but* to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*;" and to Israel, and to them only, while he was in the flesh, he sent his disciples, chap. x. 6. As to Christ's outward or first coming, Paul says, Rom. xv. 8. "That Jesus Christ was a minister of the *circumcision*, &c." Mat. xviii. 11. says, "The Son of man is come to save that which is lost." These were the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and not all the world, according to Mat. xv. 24. This is so far from including all the world, that it did not save all the Jews. For Acts xiii. 46. shows, that the Jews rejected the word of God, preached to them by Paul and Barnabas. And Jesus, because the Jews, or perhaps the lost sheep of the house of Israel, *would* not, being free-agents, be all saved, wept over Jerusalem very affectionately, because they refused to be gathered to him." Thus we see, that when Christ came outwardly, "made under the law," to his outward people, to save them, he would have saved and gathered them, but *they*, as free-agents, *would* not be saved and gathered. And this *figure* appears still to be substantiated and

* I cannot find this in the Scriptures.

exemplified; for though Christ, comes now as a light into all men, to gather and save them, yet how many *refuse* to believe in him, and refuse to receive his gospel, or power to salvation, and so are not gathered into his holy church, nor saved from their sins. I hope this answer to this important question, at the commencement of this paragraph, will satisfy; for I have not room on this sheet to say more at present.

PHILOTHEUS.

(To be Continued.)

REMARKS.

Although Philotheus accuses us of dealing hard with him, and even appeals to his *dear readers*, to sympathize with him in consequence of our *severity*, &c., unmoved we are determined to *wield* the *glittering sword* of *truth*, and impartially, candidly, and perseveringly, fight the battle out! In the language of Paul,—"For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if *one died for all*, then were *all dead*, (or all died,) And he DIED FOR ALL, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again. Wherefore, henceforth *know we no man after the flesh*; YEA, though we have *known Christ after the flesh*, yet now henceforth know we *him no more!*" Here is our ground, here is the *position* we have taken,—and we will hold it, so long as life shall animate us;—and may our right hand forget her cunning if ever we cease to defend this citadel of faith, or suffer an enemy to pollute its sacred walls with an unhallowed touch! Reader, contrast the declaration of Paul, the servant of Christ, with the following Antichristian, and abominably absurd and pharasaical declarations of Philotheus,—"I do not believe, that every man is in him, Christ,—they who abide not in Christ the vine, and are out of him, they who are in the flesh, in Adam, Cain, Esau, Hagar, Ishmael, which are the carnal natures," &c. Who is right? Shall we believe Paul, the servant and disciple of Christ, or Philotheus, the servant and disciple of Antichrist? One or the other are *wrong!* The matter is now at issue,—we are not of those, who believe that black and white are of the same colour,—we believe that truth and falsehood, or error, are the only alternatives,—every declaration we have made in our remarks on Philotheus, is supported by the plain unequivocal testimony of Scripture; and we here return to the quotation of Philotheus, see John, 8th chap. 44th verse, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do; he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." Philotheus must excuse us for using his own quotation, and we ask, where did you get your declarations, denying that sinners are in Christ, and that saints only are in Christ? Your quotations from John, prove nothing to your purpose; for *first*, Christ had not then drawn all unto him,—mankind were not then crucified with, and risen with him, for Jesus was not then crucified, &c. *Second*, according to Philotheus, none are interested in the sayings of Christ, save those to whom he spoke,—consequently, Christ's twelve disciples alone are interested! If Philotheus finds any fault with this conclusion, he has only to thank himself for the premises! The object of Philotheus appears to be, to make the *Scriptures contradict themselves*, and then bring in the *wisdom* and traditions of men, to settle the matter. We think he will have some difficulty to accomplish his project, and of the two, he will find that Relly, against whom he appears to have a particular dislike, has the Bible to support him,—and Philotheus *his own word*; consequently, he will have to contend with Jehovah, his prophets and apostles, and will in the end get wofully defeated.

Philotheus commences his *first* paragraph, by saying, "The Editor, in his last answer to Philotheus, *presumes* without *proof*,—*first*, that all men are in Christ, because the writers of the Scriptures, have in writing to the *saints*, said, "In God we live, move, and have our being," or we are complete in him, who is the head of all principality, &c., or other such passages." Solomon says," the way of transgressors is hard." And here is an evidence of it. We pity Philotheus, who is so wedded to error, that rather than acknowledge the truth, or even own the truth so far, as to acknowledge, or even refer to our evidence adduced from the Scriptures, was reduced to the pitiful shift, to *substitute a passage* for the *one* we had quoted. We repeat it, we *pity the man*, let him be whom he will, who will resort to such means to evade the truth. Philotheus adds, "Sinners are such as are not in Christ," &c. Paul declared, that he was the *chief of sinners!* Is Paul in Cain and Ishmael? *Miserable subterfuge!* For shame, Philotheus,—what! is Paul one of your *black* sons? We appeal to the conscience of Philotheus, whether his quotation, Acts xiii. 10, is not applicable to himself. It is not the righteousness which Philotheus *boasts* of, it is the righteousness of Christ, to which Elymas was an enemy. Speaking of the oath of Jehovah, Philotheus says, "it *amounts simply* to *no more*, than, that all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in Christ, the seed of Abraham, according to the flesh, but of God, according to the Spirit." The reader is requested to examine Philotheus' communication with attention, and he will find, what he means by the flesh, to be any thing but Christ. The time spent by Philotheus in *twisting* and *perverting* the Scriptures must suffice; we shall produce positive testimony to prove the fact, and if Philotheus comes forward and denies it *as usual*, we hope he will be honest enough to *own*, at *least*, that we have produced it. Paul to the Hebrews, 5th chap. 13th to 18th verses inclusive. "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying, Surely blessing, I will bless thee, and multiplying, I will multiply thee; and so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater; and an oath for confirmation *is* to them an end of all strife. Wherein God willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us." Now this promise is, that IN CHRIST, the seed of Abraham, "all the *nations* and *families* of the earth shall be blessed." Philotheus has, to use an old saying, "got his match." There is no remedy for him, but to deny the Scriptures, or confess the truth. The *twisting* and *shuffling*, has, so far, at least, in our opinion, afforded Philotheus no cause for triumph. Philotheus argues, that men are not blessed *in Christ*, because, they are not blessed *in themselves*. And to prove that sinners are not blessed *in Christ*, he instances the case of Paul, and says, "as it made Paul free from the law of sin and death." We really do not know what Philotheus will do with Paul; for Paul declared, that he was "the chief of sinners;" and Philotheus will not allow that sinners have any part or lot in the matter,—we believe, that Paul will give Philotheus a great deal of trouble before he is done with him. If Philotheus will *read* and *believe* Paul's Epistle to the Romans, he will find, that, Paul, by flesh and Spirit, means those, who, are like Philotheus, going about to establish their own righteousness, which is of the law, (flesh) and those, who trust alone to the righteousness of Christ. "Stand by, for I am holier than thou," was not Paul's doctrine; and we advise Philotheus to talk less about his *white* sons, and not to despise those, whom he describes as belonging to the "synagogue of Satan." There is one who is greater than our consciences, and who knoweth all things; his judgment will be just. And it is sufficient for us to know, that we are the chief of sinners; this thanking God, that we are not as other men are, is very poor business; and we fear, that the difference existing between the *boaster*, and those whom he despises, is very far from being in his favour! "Do ye look on things after the outward appearance? if any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that, as he *is* Christ's, even so *are* we Christ's." Cor. 2d Epistle, 10th chap. 7th verse. Philotheus, after making a few observations, says, "This may serve to *manifest*, that *all are not* IN JESUS CHRIST!" Reader, here is a man, who boldly denies the positive testimony of Scripture; and, wonderful to relate, *pretends* to believe the Scriptures; but lest his *wicked neighbours* should be as well off as himself, and receive *a penny*, he cannot help denying, even all that can give himself any reasonable hope of salvation, rather than let them come into their Father's house and be saved. In few words—we are *too good* to mix with publicans and sinners, we are righteous,—*stand off!* Paul, in the 2d chap. to Ephesians, 13th to 18th verses, "But now IN Christ Jesus, ye who were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath broken down the middle wall of partition. Having abolished IN HIS FLESH the enmity, *even* the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances, for to make IN himself of twain one new man, *so* making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God IN one body, by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and them that were nigh." There are two prominent features of doctrine in this chap. *First*, that men were *reconciled* in *one* body (Christ) on the cross. *Second*, That it is *in* Christ that this reconciliation took place. This is very offensive to Philotheus; it robs him of his *white sonship* in himself, and makes him as *black* as other folks. Philotheus, in his communication, has attempted to *crawl* away from the truth, being completely bent under the weight of evidence which pressed him. Our quotation from Colossians, 2d chap. 8th to 13th verses, he tries to evade, by saying, "as the Editor agrees, and expounds here, applying to *sinners*, and all the *world*, what Paul here spoke, *merely* to the saints and faithful brethren at Colosse." Philotheus shall have *no remedy* here, but, either to *deny in plain terms* the Scriptures, or *confess* their truth. Evasion and prevarication shall no longer avail him any thing! This bold declaration, which he has made, should be proved, or withdrawn,—it is contrary to the whole tenor of the Bible. Nay more, it is a barefaced and shameful perversion! Let us examine, and see whether Philotheus' *white sons* are alone those for whom Christ died, and whether Paul, in contradistinction to the Editor, who applies the salvation of Christ to all, merely applies it to the "faithful brethren and saints" in the little City of Colosse. In the first chap. 20th and 21st verses, Paul says, "And having (not will one of these days, when you are *white*) made peace through the blood of his cross, by him (not by our works) to reconcile *all things* unto himself; by him I say, whether *they* be things in earth, (how is this Philotheus?) or things in heaven. And you (even you, ye Colossians, are included) that were sometime alienated and enemies in your minds by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." We ask Philotheus, if all things in *heaven* and in *earth*, were in Colosse, and included in the few "faithful brethren and saints who dwelt there? If so, you have no part nor lot in the matter. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, 5th chap. 6th to 10th verses inclusive, sets Philotheus, his doctrine, and all unbelievers, at defiance. And we earnestly entreat Philotheus, in his next communication, not to deny our inferences, without denying the Scriptures they are founded upon; and to quote them instead of substituting something in their place. We use this phraseology, because we think it is impossible for him to *evade* them, and we wish to see him act candidly, otherwise he cannot expect to benefit his readers, or deserve even approbation himself. Paul declares, "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. (Quere. Do the ungodly belong to the synagogue of Satan, or are they *white sons?*) For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure, for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. (It seems it is not the Editor, but Paul, who applies the salvation of God to sinners!) Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For IF when we were *enemies*, we were *reconciled* to God by the death of his Son, *much more*, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Now, Philotheus, what do you think of "merely

applying it to the faithful brethren and saints at Colosse?" Is it the Editor, or Paul, who talks about saving sinners 1800 years ago? What think you, Philotheus, *If* when *we were* ENEMIES, we were reconciled to God by the DEATH of his SON! *much more*, BEING (already) *reconciled*, we shall be saved by his life! We request Philotheus to read this chapter carefully, and see, whether *he* cannot *apply* it to *sinners* and *all* the world. And Paul says, "but *not* as the *offence*, so also is the *gift*." We wish Philotheus to answer, without any evasion or equivocation, *one* plain *question*,—namely,—how do they differ? Is the offence greater than the gift, or the gift greater than the offence? Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians, 2d chapter, declares, "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, *even* when we were *dead in sins*, (" sinners, says Philotheus, are not of the church of Christ, but of the synagogue of Satan,") hath quickened us together with Christ, (we again ask Philotheus, when was Christ quickened? was it not 1800 years ago?) by grace are ye saved, and hath raised us up together, (when was Christ raised, was it not 1800 years ago? Answer this question) and made us sit together in heavenly places *in* Christ Jesus." We wish Philotheus to answer these questions; not quote other passages, with a view to prove these to be false. Were not sinners raised with, and in Christ? Sinners, to all intents, so far as related to any thing they did, or could do? But holy, because quickened with Christ? "For we are his workmanship, created *in* Christ Jesus unto good works," &c. Had they any thing to do in this creation? Is not this creation *in* Christ? Philotheus speaks of "many being called, and but few chosen." He is requested to look at our 17th Number, 65th page, 3d column. Relative to the Corinthians, who had *made their calling and election sure*, and whom Philotheus calls the temple of God, we ask him, how they could be sure, according to his view of the subject, when Paul says, "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy." If this is the case, and the destruction endless misery, according to your view of the subject, how can you call your election sure, &c? Philotheus, by adding to Paul, gets into trouble. We ask Philotheus for his authority, for saying, that "they who abide not in Christ, are in Adam, Cain, Esau, Hagar, and Ishmael."* We inform him, that the Scriptures no where authorize this; and the reader will properly appreciate the declarations of one, which have no support but the disturbed imagination of him who gave them birth. We suggest to Philotheus, the propriety of using more caution in future, and not attempt to palm upon the public for Scripture, the *crude* and *crooked* notions of his own head. Philotheus' "awful perversion," which he charges us with, and which he attempts to prove us guilty of, for declaring, that "none are good," and which he would construe to mean defiling the temple of God, &c., admits, we think, of a question. We declare, that all men are created anew in Christ their Head,—in Christ dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and we being complete in him, are in Christ the holy temple of God. Now, Philotheus declares, that a part of the body of Christ, or mankind, has the devil, or Satan, for their head; we, therefore, submit it to the conscience of Philotheus, whether he, and not the Editor, does not defile the temple of God, by "calling that unclean which God has cleansed?" All men are, in themselves, considered vile and wicked. But in Christ they are holy. It is in vain for Philotheus to deny this; the Scriptures are full of this doctrine,—he might as well deny the existence of any visible object. Philotheus says, "Let the defying Goliah, who scoffs at the regeneration of sinners to fit them for God's holy temple, dread the consequence!" To this we say, Amen. We believe in the regeneration of all men,—nay more, it is done! All are in Christ, born again, and the time is coming, when all shall arrive at the knowledge of their salvation; and glorify God. Philotheus has said much about our misconstruction, relative to all men being unholy; we repeat it,—and declare, that "there is none good but one, and that is God. And if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." It appears, therefore, that Philotheus is much offended at our plainness; we tell him to his head, that all his pretensions are *rotten!* And saving the righteousness of Christ, the Head of every man, which he, as a member of his body, in common with all men possess, and taking into consideration the restraining power of God, which has prevented him from the commission of many crimes, which he otherwise would have committed, he is no better than the *worst man living*. It is surely wonderful, that we are *threatened* by Philotheus, for speaking disrespectfully of the *goodness* of his *white sons*, and giving ALL the glory to God! We believe Paul was as good a man as any man living in our days, and with all his goodness, a *poor, weak, sinful* mortal. Paul told the truth when he said he was the *chief of sinners!* And when he spoke of his vile body of sin and death, he meant what he said. He did not revile himself, that others might sooth him, and say, Why Dr. Paul, you are a very good man, you are holy! Paul would have spurned the wretch who would have uttered such falsehoods. We repeat it,—God is great and good! man is weak and wicked! And we assure Philotheus, that we have no faith whatever in his *divinity* and *holiness*, but believe him to be as *vile* as the *vilest*, and the *chief of sinners!* Philotheus says, "I do not believe the oath, which the Editor mentions so exultingly," &c. Well does Philotheus observe, "For if this was a true exposition of the text, all would be saved from sins," &c. This is plain English. The Scriptures shall settle the question. We think it, however, looks *black* for a *white son* to declare, he does not believe the OATH of Jehovah! "Jesus Christ by the grace of God, tasted death for every man. The blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin. He hath by one offering, perfected for ever them that are sanctified." And "the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," are approaching,—and "All nations whom God has made, shall come and worship before him, and glorify his name." Philotheus refers his beloved readers to the 14th chap. of John, 17th verse. We ask, what does the Spirit of truth testify? This same John declares, "We have both seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the *Saviour of the world!*" Philotheus, it seems, could not find this. Quere. Supposing he had looked in that chapter where he found it said, that sinners, &c. were in Adam, Cain, Ishmael, Hagar, &c. We earnestly hope our readers will attend to the calls of the Spirit; but not the spirit that inspires Philotheus. The declaration of Paul, to "work out *your own* salvation with fear and trembling," &c., is easily explained. The *note*, Philotheus refers to, we have answered in substance a number of times, and till Philotheus produces something from Scripture, to prove the *first* part of salvation *ineffectual*, and the *second* part *absolutely necessary* in this life, we think, he had better say no more about it. We again assure Philotheus, that his declaration, especially if put against the oath of God, and the positive declarations of the Scriptures, is *good for nothing!!!* It is time to be done with this trifling. We are tired of it, and expect definite answers, and no more evasions. The declaration of Paul, Philippians, 2d chap. 12th verse, "Work out your *own salvation* with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure," is explained by the context which follows, namely,—"Do all things without murmurings and disputings; that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world." Paul, in 9th, 10th and 11th verses, informs them of a glorious truth,—that every knee should bow to Jesus' name, and every tongue confess, that he is Lord to the glory of the Father; he then says, Wherefore, or in consequence of Christ being the Saviour of all men, all in heaven and earth,—work out your salvation,—the salvation of your souls is already worked out by Christ,—do all things without murmurings and disputings, that ye may be blameless, &c., and they are encouraged to this, by a promise of assistance from God. Supposing they did not do this, therefore the consequence would be, they would not be saved from these evils in this life, but would suffer here the consequence of contention, &c. If it was the salvation of the soul which Paul meant, his language would have been different. Philotheus has done us the favour to quote a passage in point,—Isaiah, 59th chap, 16th verse,—"And he saw there was no man, and wondered there was no intercessor, therefore his arm brought salvation, and his righteousness, it sustained him." Here is proof positive, that the salvation of the *soul* is wholly without any agency of man. Again, "I am God, and beside me there is no Saviour." Consequently, God alone can, and does save the soul,—man assisted by God, can, and does frequently save the body, which is the salvation Paul refers to. In the 2d chap. of the Acts, 40th verse, Peter exhorted them, "Saying, save yourselves from this untoward generation." Not save themselves from endless misery. The declaration of Paul, "Ye are *saved* by *grace* through faith, and that not of yourselves," &c., is proof positive; and Paul, we think, knew his own meaning a little better than Philotheus. We must apologize to our readers, for consuming so much of our time and paper, in answering Philotheus. Were all our readers mature in age and experience, *ten lines* would have been sufficient, to have proved the falsity of such conclusions. Philotheus' communication is interspersed with expressions of his confirmed *aversion* to the salvation of Christ. Did he make a stand, and after denying, produce proof, he would, at least, be entitled to the appellation of being candid. Philotheus has quoted Isaiah, 59th chap. 16th verse. "Therefore his arm brought salvation," &c.; and *tries* to make it appear, that by *salvation*, is only meant, that all men were put in a *salvable condition*. Let us have a fair view of this *miserable sophistry*. By a *salvable state*, is meant, a state in which they can be saved. This supposes, that all men were in a state previous to his putting, in which they could not be saved! And Philotheus pretends, that Christ could not have saved men before they were born,—how then could they be put in a *salvable state*, before they were *in any state*? Surely Philotheus has a *poor* memory! Quere. "Is not the way of the transgressor hard?" Supposing, we should have a new translation of the Bible, and instead of reading, "his arm brought salvation," it should be rendered,—"his arm brought a *salvable* CONDITION," how would this do? Philotheus has much to say about our own salvation. Let us suppose this is never attended to by man, still Philotheus says, "all men are put into a *salvable condition*," and this is done by God. The Scriptures declare, that "whatsoever God doeth it shall be for ever!" We, therefore, ask Philotheus, how they can get out of their *salvable condition*?

(To be concluded next week.)

* Which signify, in their original languages, *Adam*, earthly,—*Cain*, possession,—*Hagar*, a stranger,—*Ishmael*, God who hears.—*Esau*, he that does, or acts.

To Correspondents.

Our correspondent at Springfield, N. J. shall be noticed in our next.

All communications forwarded the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICES.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

Those persons who reside at, or in the vicinity of Norwalk, Conn. who wish to become subscribers to this paper, are informed, that Mr. Noah S. Bailey, of Norwalk, will receive subscriptions, and supply them with the Numbers from the commencement, &c.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $3 PER YEAR, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1820. NO. 22.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Remarks on Philotheus.

(Concluded.)

Philotheus says, "*If* the new birth is not this *second* part of salvation, but is what the Editor affirms it to be, to wit,—a creation of all men anew in Christ Jesus about 1800 years ago, &c., then I think it can be proved that Paul improperly commanded us," &c. Now we think it cannot be proved. Suppose Philotheus were to answer candidly our questions, and take up *our answer* to his *first* communication, and before the public disprove our premises and conclusions, would not this be acting a little more consistent? Philotheus has evaded all our questions; and has the *effrontery* to charge us with professing a belief in *free-ageney*, &c. Let him look at our 15th Number, 60th page, 2d column, last paragraph, and answer the question there proposed. We repeat it,—Let him answer our questions, and then he is at liberty to say, "Such are the contradictory propositions and tenets of the Editor." We ask Philotheus, where is the difference, whether we believe all were created anew in Christ before they were born, or that all were "put into a *salvable condition*, before they were born?" Again, where is the difference, respecting truth, or falsehood, whether you were to say, "Yet he, the Editor, *professes* to believe in free-agency, or he, the Editor, professes to believe in Mahometanism? We assure him, that one would be as true as the other. And further, we advise *him*, in future, not to make declarations without any kind of proof whatever. And we have a right to expect, that Philotheus will either acknowledge his *error*, or produce our "*profession* of belief in free-agency." The reader will judge, we think, whether it is the Editor, or Philotheus, who is *deficient* in *modesty* and *humility*. Philotheus has given a specimen of modesty, by his note at the bottom of the column. "I cannot find this in the Scriptures." And, therefore, taking it for granted, that nothing is in the Scriptures which he could not find, he proceeded to reason accordingly, &c. We are sorry to see such conduct in a man, who introduces himself before the public as a *white son*. We shall not *sneer* at him; we *pity* this want of candour in him, and lament the effect, as much as we detest the cause. Reader, the *cause is spiritual pride!* The passages we quoted, are to be found in John, 12th chap. and 47th verse, "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came *not* to *judge* the *world*,—but to SAVE THE WORLD!" In the 17th chap. of John, 4th verse, "I have glorified thee on the earth; *I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do!*" And the same John, in his 1 Epistle, 4th chap. 14th verse, declares, "And we have seen and do testify, that *the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world!*" Philotheus is now without excuse. Will he again evade our question? Philotheus says much about the *regeneration* and *new birth*. We *inform him*, that by looking at the 19th chap. of Matthew, 28th verse, he will learn, we believe for the first time, what the *regeneration is*, and *when* it took place. Christ told his disciples, "Verily I say unto you, that ye which *have* (in the past tense) followed me in the *regeneration*, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Paul, in his Epistle to Titus, 3d chap. 5th to 6th verse, explains the regeneration to be *through* Christ. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of *regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour." Now, we ask, whether this *regeneration* did not take place 1800 years ago? *Ans.* It did,—and Philotheus, with all his *sophistry* and *evasion*, cannot prove to the contrary. Relative to the *new birth*, we have proved already, in our former answers to Philotheus, that it *was in* Christ 1800 years ago! In the first Epistle of Peter, 1st chap. 3d verse, "Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us AGAIN, unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." Why should Peter say, "begotten us again," if we had not been *begotten*, or *born* before in Christ? And Peter declares, by the *resurrection* of Jesus Christ from the dead. And Paul declares, "He rose again for our justification." Did not Christ rise from the dead 1800 years ago? *Ans.* Evade, and equivocate no longer. Is not *regeneration*, *justification*, and the *new birth*, synonymous terms? If not, prove, *if you can*, to the contrary! Christ told Nicodemus, "*Ye must*" (in the future tense) be *born again*." When Christ spoke these words, it *was future*, for he was not then *crucified* or *raised*,—but it is now *past*,—1800 years have rolled away, since we were *drawn* unto him,—*crucified with him*,—"For if one died for all, then all died!" Paul, the servant of Christ, says, "Be it known unto you, that *Christ* is the *head of every man!*" Philotheus says,—NO! *not so!* Reader, there is a LIE between Paul and Philotheus; to whom does it belong? We, therefore, address Philotheus, in the words of Paul; See Romans 14th chap. 8th to 10th verses, "For whether we live, we live unto the Lord, and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we *live*, therefore, or *die*, we are the Lord's. For to this end, Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost *thou set at nought thy brother?* for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ," &c. The latter part of Philotheus' communication, is declaration without proof. He again reiterates, "He cannot find, or he has been SEARCHING without success to find the expression, that Jesus said he *came to save* the world!!!" Did Philotheus *search* as often to find *salvation*, as he does to find *damnation*, he would not come forward in this manner, which, to say the least, is a sorry comment on his *zeal* or *knowledge!* The conclusion of Philotheus' communication, is so *absurd* and *inconsistent*, and so outrageously perversive of the Scriptures, that we think any *exposure* of it unnecessary. We, however, inform Philotheus, that *we do* not "urge him to write;" we urge him, when he has written error, to confess it, if he cannot prove it truth. Relative to his "deserving all this,"—we inform him, that he has experienced but the "first part" of the combat,—he has only so far, *skirmished* with the *out-posts*,—the *main body* is *yet* in the *rear*,—and if he "falls on it, he shall be broken; but, if it falls on him, it will GRIND HIM TO POWDER!

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR,—As you profess to crown King Jesus Lord of all, to the glory of God the Father,—by inserting the following remarks in your Herald, you may honour the Saviour, and glorify Almighty God; as well, as much oblige many of your readers.

For more than a thousand years it has been a subject much disputed by Christians, whether the Messiah, and the Infinite Being who sent him, are one, and the same Almighty God of all, or two separate and unequal beings.

Fallible men may err in answering this mysterious question; but there is one infallible man who declared, that he always spoke the truth, which he heard of God; he has given an impartial answer, and his decisions are a divine law. The heavenly Saviour informs his disciples, that he did not come of himself, to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him;—and the works which he did, testified that God sent him;—that he did not know the time of the day of judgment, but his Father only;—that it was eternal life to know God, and regard himself, as his messenger, whom he sent; and that *his Father was greater than him*;—and whenever his disciples prayed, they must ask him nothing, but pray to his Divine Father, for all true worshippers worshipped him, who is a Spirit, as their God alone.

First,—By inference we learn, that Jesus Christ never *once declared*, that *himself and his heavenly Father* were ONE God; but expressly and repeatedly affirmed, that they were TWO, *separate characters*, and *unequal* beings,—*one* acting as a *servant*, and in subordination to the other, as Supreme God of all. Christ worshipped that Being who sent him, as the *one* God and Father of all. *Second*,—That as the Messiah was *better qualified*, than any other man, to publish his *own unity*, and the *unity* of that Infinite God who sent him,—Protestant Christians must acknowledge, that Christ's description of the *unity* of the *person* of his heavenly Father, and his command and example to worship him alone, is the only infallible standard of divine worship for Christians to copy after.

Finally, If all Christians would only *unite* and abandon all earthly mysteries, and their human descriptions of the *unity* of Jehovah, and implicitly imitate their heavenly Master in worshipping his Divine Father *alone*, who is a Spirit, in spirit, and in truth, they would honour and exalt them both, far more, than in contending to destroy *their opposite unities*, and *compounding* them *both* into *one*, and the *same* Almighty God. These are the conclusions of the writer, and if he is mistaken, he will thank any one to prove it, and he will recant his error.

E. HARMAN,

Springfield, N. J.

REMARKS.

The frankness of our correspondent in stating his opinions, and the *authority* on which they are based, is entitled to approbation. If he is *wrong*, one of two things must be evident; either the authority is not sufficient, or he has misunderstood, and consequently misapplied it. The question is proposed, or stated, in his second paragraph; and it is unequivocal, and of necessity simple, &c. It is, "whether the Messiah, *Jesus Christ*, and that Infinite Being who sent him, are ONE and the same *Almighty God* of all, or TWO *separate* beings." Now we have a question to ask; and we think it is a *very important one*, and we entreat the reader to keep sight of it,—How many Almighty Gods or Beings are there, and what are we to understand by an Almighty God, or Being? We answer; a Being *cannot* be *Almighty*, if there is any *might* or *power*, beside his *might*, or *power*; or, in other words, which is not derived from him; for we believe the word *all*, means *all*,—consequently, if there is any *might* or *power*, except, or beside God's *might*, or *power*, he is not Almighty, or does *not possess*, and did not possess *all might*, or *power*, and consequently, is not Almighty, because there is *might* which is not his, and does not belong to him. We think this is plain and cannot be misunderstood. It, therefore, follows, as an inevitable consequence, that there cannot possibly be TWO Almighty *Gods*, or *Beings*, or *causes*. This can never be controverted,—nay more,—no person in his senses ever would undertake it. The unity of God, therefore, is established from *necessity*; and that *necessity* is the *immutable effect* of an *immutable* and Almighty cause! And that cause is God! The question, therefore, proposed by our correspondent, is necessarily resolved to be, whether

the Messiah,or Jesus Christ, was the *manifested* God, or God manifest, or *Known, in* Christ, or whether Christ *was*, and *is*, a *separate* and distinct *being*. If *separate*, he was *not* God—therefore, not Almighty. The question is now at issue. It must occur to the reader, that the words, or *declaration*, "God *manifest*, or *known* in the *flesh*," would not only be a very improper, but a positively false declaration, if God was not manifest in the flesh! And if God was manifest in the flesh, or Messiah, or Christ, then of necessity, the Being who was manifest was God, and *Almighty*. We must, therefore, understand by the expression, *Almighty*, a being possessed of *all* power, and that there *cannot* be any power which is not derived from him. Christ declared, see Matthew, 28th chap. 18th verse, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." The Being who made this declaration, was, and is, Almighty,—for *all power*, is all power! This declaration is unequivocal and emphatic. Is it truth? If so, there can be but two alternatives,—either Almighty God *dwelt in Christ fully*, or Christ derived Almighty power from God, and God *ceased to be Almighty!* The last cannot be true; for he has declared, "I am God, I change not,—I am God, and beside me there is no Saviour; and my honour I will not give to another." Therefore, the declaration of Paul is truth,—"In Christ dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily." And of Christ,—"I and my Father are ONE!" If it is objected, that the giver, and the receiver, the sender, and sent, are two, we answer,—Christ, see John, 17th chap. 5th verse, said, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with *thine own self*; with the *glory which I had with thee before* the world was." The Father, therefore, *dwelt in Christ*, "before the world was;" and Christ *then* possessed Almighty power. Paul unquestionably spoke from understanding, when he declared, of Christ, see Philippians, 2d chap. 6th verse, "who being (in the past tense,) in the *form of God*, thought it not robbery (it was not arrogating what did not belong to him) to be equal with (or as) God; but *made* (in the future tense) himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." Here are *three* things worthy of special notice,—*first*, this Being whom the Scriptures call the Saviour, was, originally, and "before the world was," in the *form of God.*—*Second*, He made himself, (not made so by another) of no reputation, &c. *Third*, He made himself in the *likeness of man*. It, therefore, follows, as an inevitable consequence, that this Being was *not a man*, but only *appeared to man*, in that "likeness," or "form;" and that the *form*, or *likeness*, which he assumed, or *made*, was his *own act*; and that *his proper*, and *own* form was *God!* This is the *plain, unequivocal* meaning of the words; and they cannot, except by force, be made to express any thing else. The humanity, therefore, in the form of Jesus the Redeemer, was called Immanuel: See Isaiah, 7th chap. 14th verse. "Therefore, the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bare a son, and shall call his name IMMANUEL." Matthew, 1st chap. 23d verse, "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name IMMANUEL, which, being interpreted, is,GOD WITH US." Was this the proper interpretation? Or was Matthew mistaken? We think not. Paul declares, see his 1st Epistle to Timothy, 3d chap. 16th verse, "God was manifest in the flesh!" The declaration of Jehovah, by his prophet Isaiah, "I am God, and beside me there is NO Saviour," is proof positive, that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself;" agreeably to Paul's declaration; and it, therefore, follows, that if there is "no Saviour beside God." there is *no God beside the Saviour!* This can never be controverted! The reverse of this would be, not only absurd, but absolutely impossible! It, therefore, follows, of inevitable necessity,—that Christ is God Almighty, or Christ is not a Saviour,—and further, it likewise follows, that if any man can save his own soul, he is God, or else there is no meaning in language, nor truth in the Scriptures!

The declaration of Christ, quoted by our correspondent, in his second paragraph, that "his Father was greater than him," is plain and consistent with Paul's testimony, relative to "being in the form of God," and his taking the "form or likeness of a servant." Therefore, the declaration, "the Father is greater than I," is of precisely the *same import* with Paul's declaration, "Who being in the form of God, (or the Father.) made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant." It is plain, from these testimonies, that God, or the Father, made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant,—the form of God, or Father, was the true form, and was greater than the form of the servant,—and when Christ said, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with *thine own self*; with the glory I had with thee before the world was," we must consider him to have meant, by the words *thine own self*, the *form of God*, which was *laid aside*, (if we may be allowed the expression) when the *form* of the *servant was taken*, &c. All mankind were the servants of sin, and became so by transgression,—God took upon him *this form* of the *sinful servants*,—he *purged* and *sanctified*, or *purified* that *form*. The declaration of Paul, see Hebrews, 10th chap. &c. "Wherefore, when he cometh into the world,he saith,Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but *a body* hast thou prepared me; (who, we ask, prepared the body? *Ans.* See Philippians, 2d chap. 6th verse; it is God,made himself (God) a body,) in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure,*—then said I, Lo! I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will,O God!" The prophet Isaiah declares,42d chap. 21st verse, "The Lord, (the word in the original, which is here rendered Lord, is Jehovah,) is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; *he will magnify* the *law*, and make it honourable." Who, we ask, will do this? *Ans.* JEHOVAH! And when JEHOVAH GOD, "took upon himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men," he declared, see Matthew, 5th chap. 17th verse, "Think not that I am come to destroy the LAW, or the prophets; I am *not come to destroy*, but to *fulfil*." Who, we ask, came to fulfil? *Ans.* JEHOVAH!

Our correspondent commences his *fourth* paragraph, by *inferring*, from his foregoing premises, *first*,—"That Jesus Christ never once declared, that *himself* and his *heavenly Father* were ONE God; but expressly, and repeatedly affirmed, that they were TWO separate characters, and unequal beings," &c. To this we answer, Christ *expressly* declared, "I and my Father are ONE!" The Scriptures declare, expressly, "The Lord thy God, is ONE God! I am God, and beside me there is no Saviour!" Shall we presume to say, that Christ meant, when he said, "I and my Father are ONE! That *he* and his *Father* were TWO? Had Christ declared, "I and my Father are" two, our correspondent would have *positive testimony* to prove his hypothesis; and had Christ been silent on this subject, he would have *negative testimony*; but there is now *positive testimony* against him! Our correspondent adds, "but expressly, and repeatedly affirmed, they were TWO separate characters, and unequal beings!" To this, we answer, first, if this statement is correct, it is evident, that Christ affirmed at one time, what he contradicted, by his affirmations, at another time. For Christ and his Father to be ONE, and at the same time to be "*separate* characters and unequal beings," is, of all contradictions, the greatest! How can TWO beings, be ONE being? Our correspondent is requested to admit the Apostle Paul as an evidence in this case; we believe him to be a good witness, and that he testifies to the truth. Paul says, "And being in the form of God," consequently, in the character of God, "he thought it not robbery to be equal to God;" if he was unequal, and a separate character, it would have been robbery, for it would have been arrogating, or taking what did not belong to him; "he took upon him the form of a servant," not the being of a servant; if this had been the case, he would have changed, and would indeed have been of a different character, and an unequal being! Christ did not say, the form of a servant, and the likeness of men, (which I now appear in to mankind,) and the Father are ONE! But I! Who? *Ans.* "I! I the Lord, mighty to save; I, who am God, and beside whom there is none else; I, who being in the form of God; I and the Father are ONE!" We consider the declaration, "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and because I live, ye shall live also," to mean, that human nature, the form of a servant, which God assumed and anointed by his indwelling as the Christ; the "Head of every man," possessed by the indwelling of the Father, the self-existence of the Father, "and because I live," &c., Christ the Head of all, by the union of the human and divine, made the human nature eternal and self-existent by this union, which is guaranteed by the eternity of the existence of Jehovah, who took this form, human nature, as his heritage and possession. This is the truth, and well does the apostle declare, see John, first Epistle, 3d chap. 2d verse, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; (of God; mark well the phraseology of this passage) and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; (or, we do not yet know, our knowledge being, like ourselves in this life, imperfect;) but WE KNOW (or we believe the promises of God; see Hebrews, 6th chap. 18th to 20th verses inclusive,) that, when he shall appear, (who? *Ans.* God!) we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is!" How shall we see God? *Ans.* We shall then see "God in Christ, the Saviour of the world, the Head of every man!" A UNIT!!! GOD THE HEAD! *All* men and every man, the members of HIS BODY! All creation in UNITY!

DIVISION IS RUIN,—UNION IS GLORY.

"Finally, if all Christians would only unite, and abandon all earthly mysteries, and their human descriptions of the *unity* of Jehovah, and implicitly imitate their heavenly Master in worshipping his divine Father alone, who is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth, they would honour and exalt them both (both, who? "I and the Father are ONE!") far more, than in contending for their opposite unities, (how is this? what do you mean by opposite unities? Do you mean two unequal unities?) and compounding them both into *one*, and the same Almighty God!" So says our correspondent:—Now, we agree with him so far, as to acknowledge, "that all Christians should unite and abandon all earthly mysteries, and *their human description* of the unity of Jehovah, &c.; and that in worshipping the divine Father alone, &c., they would honour," &c.; but when our correspondent talks of "contending for their opposite unities,and compounding them both into one and the same Almighty God," we really think he is swallowed up in the "*earthly mysteries and human descriptions*," which he believes are so unprofitable. Now we believe there is but one God; consequently, we believe in the unity of God; the word unit meaning one! And if we were to pretend, that we also believe, that this unit, or one God, was composed, or compounded, of THREE persons, we should of necessity believe, that a unit is three; and if we contended, that these three persons were only *one* BEING, we should be under the necessity of acknowledging, either that each of these three persons possessed in himself only one-third of a being, or, if this divisibility was objected to, that one person possessed *all* the *being*, and the other two persons had no being! There is but one more possible shape in which this can be viewed, and that is, to suppose, that each of these three persons possesses a being, distinct and separate, one from the other; in this view of the subject, there are three Gods, persons, or beings; and we might as well have 3000. Our correspondent speaks of "opposite unities;" and we have something more than conjecture to help us to his meaning, when we recur to his fourth paragraph, where he declares of Christ, "that he expressly,and repeatedly affirmed, that they were

* This is a terrible reproof to the "fire and brimstone preachers," of the present day. "God has no pleasure in the death of the sinner, in burnt offerings for sin," says the Redeemer God, "thou" (or I, for "I and the Father," or thou, "are one!") "hast had no pleasure!" How, then, dare these unbelievers declare, that God will himself sacrifice millions of his creatures, even the members of his own body too, as burnt offerings in HELL! This is, indeed a DAMNABLE HERESY,—and the DOCTRINE OF DEVILS!!!

two, separate and unequal beings; one acting as a servant, and in subordination to the other." To this we reply,—Christ never ONCE affirmed, that "He and his Father were TWO separate and unequal beings!" And further, we expect the reader will take it for granted, at least, that our correspondent is wrong, until he proves that he is right! And for ourselves, we are compelled to believe, that our correspondent means, by "opposite unities," n the connexion in which he has used the terms, the being of God the Father, and the being of Christ the Redeemer. We do not recollect of reading of these "opposite unities" in the Scriptures, and on the whole, we think our correspondent has put wrong constructions upon the Scriptures, to say the least, although we presume to say, he did it unintentionally.

Answer to Pothos.

In which the apparent disagreement, in Matthew and Luke's account of the genealogy of our Saviour, is reconciled, and their accounts proved to be in unison, &c.

Not having received any communication in answer to Pothos' genealogical inquiry, we request his attention to the following, which is a brief exhibition of the sentiments and opinions of the celebrated Dr. Clark, who says, "Perhaps few questions have occasioned much more trouble and perplexity to the learned, than that which concerns the genealogy of our blessed Lord, as it is given by the evangelists, St. Matthew and St. Luke. The tables found in these writers are extremely different, or, as some think, contradictory. Allowing the Divine Inspiration of the authors, we must grant that they could make no mistake in any point, and especially on a subject where the truth of the Gospel History, and the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies, are so nearly concerned. The expression of Le Clerc, however, *universam antiquitatem excitam habuere*, is not strictly true. In later times the difficulty has certainly excited much discussion; but it is worthy of remark, that while the archives of the Jews remained entire, the accuracy of the evangelists was never called in question. Hence it follows, either that some corruptions have since that time crept into the text, or, that the true method of reconciling the seeming inconsistencies was then better understood. The silence of the enemies of the gospel, both Heathen and Jewish, during even the *first* century, is itself a sufficient proof, that neither inconsistency nor corruption could be *then* alledged against the Evangelist's History. If a charge of this nature could have been supported, it unquestionably would have been made. The Jews and heathens were agreed in their hostility to the religion of Christ, were equally interested in this subject; and could they have proved that a single flaw existed in these genealogical tables, they might at once have set aside the pretensions of our Lord and his disciples; for if the lineal descent of Jesus from David were not indisputable, he could not possess the character essential to the Messiah, nor any right to the Jewish throne. If his title, in this respect, were even questionable, it is impossible to suppose that the Jews would have withheld an allegation, which must fully vindicate them in denying his Messiahship, and in putting him to death as an impostor. We may confidently assert, therefore, that his regular lineal descent from David could not be disproved, since it was not even disputed, at a time when alone it could have been done successfully, and by those persons who were so deeply interested in the event.

The sincere believer may consequently be assured, that whatever difficulties appear at present, had formerly no existence, and are even now of such a nature as cannot be allowed to shake the faith of any reasonable man. I would not, however, be understood to intimate that these difficulties are now insuperable; on the contrary, I am satisfied that the *real* difficulties are few, and that these have, for the most part, been satisfactorily explained by most of the evangelical harmonists." Dr. Clark reconciles this apparent disagreement in the following manner, &c.

"Being (*as was supposed*) *the son of Joseph*. This same phrase is used by Herodotus to signify one who was only *reputed* to be the son of a particular person, *τουτου παις νομιζεται, he was supposed to be this man's son*. Much learned labour has been used to reconcile this genealogy with that in St. Matthew, 1st chap. and there are several ways of doing it: the following, which appears to me to be the *best*, is also the most *simple* and *easy*.

Matthew in *descending* from Abraham to Joseph, the spouse of the blessed virgin, speaks of sons *properly such*, by way of natural generation: *Abraham begat Isaac, and Isaac begat Jacob*, &c. But Luke in *ascending* from the Saviour of the world, to God himself, speaks of *sons* either *properly* or *improperly* such: on this account he uses an *indeterminate* mode of expression, which may be applied to sons, either *putatively* or *really* such. *And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being as was supposed, the son of Joseph,—of Heli,—of Matthat.* This receives considerable support from Rapheleus' method of reading the original ων (ως ενομιζετο υιος Ιωσηφ) του Ηλι, *being*, (*when reputed the son of Joseph*) *the son of Heli*, &c. That St. Luke does not always speak of sons *properly* such, is evident, from the first and last person which he names; *Jesus Christ* was the *supposed* son of Joseph, because Joseph was the husband of his mother Mary: and *Adam*, who is said to be the *son of* God, was such, only by *creation*. After this observation it is next necessary to consider, that in the genealogy described by St. Luke, there are two sons *improperly* such: i. e. *two sons-in-law*, instead of two sons

As the Hebrews never permitted *women* to enter into their genealogical tables, whenever a family happened to end with a *daughter*, instead of naming her in the genealogy, they inserted her *husband* as the *son* of him, who was, in reality, but his *father-in-law*. This import, Bishop Pearse has fully shown νομιζεσθαι bears, in a variety of places,—Jesus was *considered according to law*, or *allowed custom*, to be the son of Joseph, *as he* was of Heli. The two *sons in law* who are to be noticed in this genealogy are *Joseph*, the son-in-law of Heli; whose *own* father was Jacob, Matthew, 1st chap. 16th verse, and *Salathiel*, the son-in-law of *Neri*; whose *own* father was *Jechonias*, 1Chron. 3d, 17th, and Mat. 1st, 12th. This remark alone, is sufficient to remove every difficulty. Thus it appears that Joseph, *son* of *Jacob*, according to St. Matthew, was *son-in-law of Heli* according to St. Luke. And *Salathiel, son of Jechonias*, according to the former, was *son-in-law of Neri*, according to the latter. Mary, therefore, appears to have been the daughter of Heli, so called by abbreviation for *Heliachim*, which is the same in Hebrew with *Joachim*. Joseph son of Jacob, and Mary daughter of Heli, were of the *same* family: both came from *Zorobabel;* Joseph from *Abiud*, his eldest son, Matthew 1st, 13th, and *Mary* by *Rhesa*, the youngest. See verse 27th, *Salathiel* and *Zorobabel*, from whom St. Matthew and St Luke cause Christ to proceed, were themselves descended from *Solomon* in a direct line. And though St. Luke says, that Salathiel was son of *Neri;* who was descended from *Nathan*, Solomon's eldest brother, 1st Chron. iii. 5. this is only to be understood of his having espoused *Nathan's daughter*, and that *Neri* dying, probably without male issue, the two branches of the family of David, that of *Nathan*, and that of *Solomon*, were both united in the person of *Zorubabel*, by the marriage of *Salathiel* chief of the royal family of Solomon, with the daughter of Neri, chief and heretrix of the family of *Nathan*. Thus it appears, that Jesus Son of Mary re-united in himself all the blood, privileges, and rights of the whole family of David; in consequence of which, he is emphatically called the *Son of David*. It is worthy of being remarked, that St. Matthew, who wrote principally for the *Jews* extends his genealogy to *Abraham*, through whom the promise of the Messiah was given to the Jews: but St. Luke, who wrote his history for the instruction of the *Gentiles*, extends his genealogy to *Adam*, to whom the promise of the Redeemer was given in behalf of himself and of all his posterity. See the notes on Mat. 1st 1, &c. [verse 36. Of Cainan] This *Cainan* the son of *Arphaxad*, and father of *Sala*, is not found in any other part of the Scripture genealogy. See Gen. x. 24. xi. 12. 1. Chron. i. 18, 24. where *Arphaxad* is made the father of *Sala*, and no mention at all made of *Cainan*. Some suppose that *Cainan* was a sirname of *Sala;* and that the names should be read together thus, the son of *Heli*, the son of *Salacainan*, the son of *Arphaxad*, &c. If this does not untie the knot, it certainly *cuts* it; and the reader may pass on without any great scruple or embarrassment. There are many sensible observations on this genealogy, in the notes at the end of Bishop Newcome's Harmony.

Dr. Barnet, (says Dr. Clark,) takes into consideration, the family of *Anna*, the mother of *Mary*. It is agreed, that the father of Anna was named *Matthan;* who this person was, is not easy to be known. Some suppose him to have been a *priest;* and as it was lawful for the daughters of the priests to marry into any tribe, (Lev. xxii. 12.) we may perceive how Mary could be the cousin (συγγενης) of Elizabeth, (who was really of the tribe of Levi) though her father Joachim or Eli, was a descendant of the tribe of Juda.

Dr. Clark observes, that the *peculiar manner* used by some of the eastern nations in recording their *genealogies*, is one cause of their present obscurity. The following, from the ingenious Mr. Harmer, the Doctor introduces, as referring to a case in point, "Genealogical tables were kept among the Jews with great exactness. Every person of learning however knows, that the great difference in this point between St. Matthew and St. Luke, who have each of them given us a genealogy of our Lord, has greatly embarrassed the curious, and did so early; (see Aug. Retract. 1. ii. c. 7.) but as in other cases, what was at first thought an objection against the sacred writer, has turned out in his favour; so doubly will this, when it shall be thoroughly cleared up. Time may perhaps do it: all I would attempt to show here is, that there has been lately discovered an inscription at Palmyra, which has just the same difficulty. He that clears up the Syrian difficulty, will, I presume, clear up the *sacred*. To which I would add, that it is to be remembered, that Palmyra was in the neighbourhood of Judea, and the inscriptions that are found there, are about the apostolic age. As to the *inscription*, I refer to Mr. Wood, the ingenious editor of those ruins, who has observed, that it was more difficult to understand than translate it. This, says he, will appear by rendering it literally, which is easiest done, into Latin, thus: Senatus populusque Alialamenem Pani filium, Mocimi nepotem, Æranis pronepotem, Mathœ abnepotem, et Æranem patrem ejus, viros pios et patriœ amicos, et omni modo placentes patriœ partriisque diis, honoris gratia. Anno 450, Mense Aprili. Our difficulty is, continues he, that Æranes is called the *father* of Alialamenes, who is himself called the son of Panus, just in the same manner as St. Matthew tells us that *Jacob begat Joseph;* and St. Luke calls Joseph, *the son of Heli*. There is something without doubt in these affairs peculiar to the east, which, however, unknown to us, was common to the Jews and people of Palmyra; and will, when properly explained, be a proof of the authenticity of these genealogies, instead of an objection." Harmer's Observations.

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor,—In your 18th Number of the Gospel Herald, Mary, in her communication, remarks thus,—"Suppose a beggar was to ask you for a piece of bread, and you gave it to him, would he have obtained it, if he had not asked for it? The condition is asking for the bread, but not meriting it." Now if our salvation depends on asking, and we are to be *lost without* this asking,—I would *ask Mary*, if there is no *merit in* asking? And if we can obtain salvation by *asking*, can we not do *something*? And if we say that we can do *something*, do we not contradict St. Paul, who declares, expressly, "ye can of yourselves do *nothing*? I am a *plain* woman as well as Mary, and request of her a *plain* answer.

Laura

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Cicilia presents the Editor, her unfeigned thanks, for noticing her communication; and also, for his able exposition of that passage of Scripture, which the opposers of Universalism generally declare to be unanswerable, by asserting, that it points out a sin that hath never forgiveness, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. With a mind void of prejudice, she has thoroughly perused his explanation of it, and acknowledges herself perfectly inadequate to discover any subterfuge or unfairness in the reasonings there contained. Neither have her friends been able to discern in it any discongruity with the tenor of the Scripture. Yet they are very solicitous to see some learned Theologist maintain a controversy with the Editor on the same subject; as they have heretofore believed that passage to be the greatest objection in the Scriptures to his doctrine. But since reading his exposition of it, they are almost universally of the opinion, that *endless misery* cannot be proved from it, provided he has given a *just translation* of it. Of this, they are not *sufficiently positive*, yet acknowledge they have but little ground to *doubt it*, since there is not a man, among all the Editor's learned opponents, neither Veritatis Amicus, Philotheus, nor Mikross, who has yet attempted to refute it! Mikross, it is true, in the 19th Number of the Gospel Herald, has animadverted upon some of the Editor's observations, contained in the exposition alluded to; yet has not attempted to refute that part of the exposition, which is more particularly adapted to sap the basis of all the dominent systems of limited salvation; and to build up that doctrine, which Mikross does not *directly impugn*, but which he appears to be *obliquely* attempting to detrude. If Mikross is zealous in "The cause of truth," let him commence a *direct* attack on the Editor's doctrine; and let him convince the Public, *if possible*, that his translation of that passage of Scripture is erroneous, and only designed for a miserable prop, to "prop up," what Mikross is pleased to call, "the falling ruins of error." Cicilia is desired, by her friends, to represent to Mikross, in particular, as he has attempted to animadvert upon part of the Editor's examination, &c., of the doctrine of the *unpardonable sin*, that he would confer on them a favour, if he would notice the *translation* there given; and should it, in his opinion, prove incorrect, oblige them by publishing, in this paper, his own translation of the passage, with his exposition of the same. Cicilia likewise, that no means may be neglected whereby truth may be manifested, earnestly beseeches every reader of the Gospel Herald, to exhibit this Epistle to the learned of every description, and to beseech them, as they *value* the *good* of *souls*, to enlighten the public with *their* translations and expositions, if Mikross should shrink from the undertaking.

Cicilia is also desired by her friends to state, that if, after so solemn a request, the *learned* should remain silent on this subject, they shall be obliged to consider *their silence* a tacit *acknowledgment*, that the exposition of the Editor is *incontrovertible;* and also, shall positively believe, that the *greatest* objection, in the Scriptures, to Universalism is completely removed!

Cicilia hopes, that her anxiety for the knowledge of the truth, and the desire of gratifying her friends, will be deemed a sufficient apology for the above request on the learned; and also, for soliciting the Editor to obviate one more objection to his doctrine, which if done to her satisfaction, she will express her gratitude by ceasing from any further importunity. The passage containing her objection, may be found in Mat. 26th chap 24th verse, and reads thus, "The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but wo unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It had been good for that man if he had not been born." By giving it a candid explanation, Mr. Editor, you will confer a second obligation on your friend and well wisher,

CICILIA.

P. S. Cicilia assures her readers, that she is fully sensible of her illiteracy; yet looking beyond the grave, she is resolved that no consideration shall discourage her from the pursuit of truth. She assures the *critic*, that he is *welcome* to her *errors*.

MATTHEW, XXVI. 24,

The Son of Man goeth as it is written of him; but wo unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It had been good for that man if he had not been born.

This declaration of our Saviour, which our correspondent has introduced, as being in the opinion of some an objection to the truth of the doctrine of the salvation of *all men*, is, in our opinion, easily and effectually answered. It is not uncommon for the opposers of the truth, to array Scripture against Scripture, and when they cannot *convince*, try to *confound*. This conduct is both criminal and contemptible,—it evinces both *ignorance* and *cowardice*, and is as despicable in *theology*, as *murder* in war, when inoffensive people are destroyed, lest they should at a future time prove *foes!* The Scriptures are consistent; it is the unbeliever in their doctrines who is *inconsistent*. Therefore, the declaration of Peter, see Acts, 3d chap. 20th, 21st verses, "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of *all things*, which GOD HATH SPOKEN by the mouth of *all his holy prophets* since the world began." This declaration, therefore, and the declaration so frequently brought forward against the salvation of Judas, are in perfect harmony and agreement. But, those unbelievers who deny the *restitution* which God *himself testifies of*, are under the necessity of *perverting* the declaration of the Saviour, to justify them in their unbelief. Ezekiel, one of God's holy prophets, testifies, see 16th chap. that the ancient Sodomites, &c., and Jews, should return to their former estate; and God will *establish* (not make) a covenant with them. The restitution, declared by the apostle, and the *former state*, which *God spoke* of by the *mouth* of *Ezekiel*, are one and the same. The Jews, to whom Ezekiel addressed this prophecy, were living; and the *former estate*, to which they should return, was a state, which they must have been in before *they were born!* And it must have been *the state* of innocence, in which *they were made*, and lost by their *associated* sin and fall, in and with Adam. If this is denied, we answer,—then it *inevitably follows*, that the state which Ezekiel spoke of, was a state of *nonentity;* or more properly, *no state*,—this would be a contradiction in terms. The phraseology of the prophet Ezekiel is remarkable. "And I will establish my covenant with thee." This *covenant* was *their former estate*,—it is not to be made,—nor renewed,—but ESTABLISHED! What is this *Covenant? Ans.* See Isaiah, 42d chap. 6th, 7th verses. Reader, it is God who speaks, and it is "of the restitution of all things," hear ye him,—"I the Lord have called thee (Christ) in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and *give thee for a covenant* of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes,—to bring out the prisoners from the prison,—them that *sit in darkness out of the prison house!*" DARKNESS, and a PRISON, therefore, is the *present estate;* and Paul, see Romans, 8th chap. 19th to 23d verses, says, "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected in hope. (Quere. Is endless misery hope?) Because the creature itself also shall be delivered (Quere. If the *creature* is miserable without end, when will the creature be delivered? Paul does not say may, but *shall*) from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know, that the WHOLE CREATION groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body." Therefore, the *blindness*, *darkness*, and *prison*, spoken of by the prophet, and the *bondage* of *corruption* mentioned by the apostle, are the same. And the reverse of this, is "their former estate;" and is what the apostle describes, as the "glorious liberty of the children of God." We are willing to rest our cause on these evidences; and *we challenge all creation* to prove to the contrary of our conclusions, if the premises are admitted,—and they cannot be evaded, except the truth of the Scriptures are denied. Go to the *Hospital of incurables*, and you will not find a lunatic, who in the very paroxysm of his distraction will outrage common sense in a more direct and effectual manner, than our celebrated doctors of Divinity, who contend for premises, and deny their conclusions,---nay more,---the story of the "common sized beehive, and bees as large as oxen," is not more ridiculously inconsistent and contradictory, than their premises and conclusions! What! declare that all men *sinned*, *fell* and *died* in Adam, and deny that they had any soul, or existence, previous to their appearance in this earthly body? Is the soul composed of atmospheric air, and gendered in a western breeze? Such conclusions are inexpressibly absurd. What, we ask, is the former estate, spoken of by the prophet? Is it a representative state, in which all the human race are represented by Adam? Was Adam like those whom he represented? If not, he could not be their representative,---and if like them, he must have been a nonentity, for those whom he represented according to the common hypothesis, had no existence. If it is contended, that Adam represented those who should be after him, we ask, How Adam in the image of God, a perfect good man, could be the representative of imperfect wicked men? There is no similarity, and without it, there can be no representation. Paul says, "As in Adam all die," &c. Can men die, before they live? NO! It is impossible! If it is objected, that men would remember their pre-existent state, we answer, when a man dies, he forgets, if we are to judge from the figurative language of the prophet and apostle; for when all died in Adam, they were made subject to darkness, in prison, blind, and in the bondage of corruption; and God declared, that his people did not know, nor consider; the ox knew his owner, &c., but even the people of God were more ignorant than the brutes. It is from this that they are to be delivered, and "into the glorious liberty of the children of God." We again ask the question, What was the former estate? Was Judas ever in this former estate? If so, he shall return to it. If Judas was of Adam's race, he was once in this former estate. The declaration of Christ, relative to Judas, is considered to be *judicial* and *dicisive* of his fate. Indeed, the whole weight of the argument rests here. Judas must be endlessly miserable, because Christ said, or pronounced, a *wo* upon him, which amounts to a *condemnatory* sentence. This is, we believe, the very corner stone in the foundation of the argument. But, we can produce one declaration, and a positive one too, which will decide this part of the question for ever; see John, 12th chap. 47th verse. "And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not, for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world."

(To be concluded next week.)

Another Conversion in the Ministry.

Asa Barton, a Methodist preacher in Paris, (Maine) was lately brought to the knowledge of the truth, that Christ is the Saviour of all men; and is now zealous in a good cause.

U. Magazine. Boston, Mass.

To Correspondents.

DEAN, and AN IMPARTIALIST are received, and will appear in our next.

NOTICES.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

Those persons who reside at, or in the vicinity of Norwalk, Conn. who wish to become subscribers to this paper, are informed, that Mr. Noah S Bailey, of Norwalk, will receive subscriptions, and supply them with the Numbers from the commencement, &c.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1820. NO. 23.

Remarks on Matthew, xxvi. 24.

(Concluded.)

The declaration of Christ, therefore, was an expression of *pity*, instead of a sentence of *condemnation*. The word in the original, which is translated *wo* in this passage, is ουαι, and is the same word, which is translated *alas*, six times in Rev. 18th chap. 10th 16th, and 19th verses. The word *alas*, according to Dr. Johnson, is derived from the French, *helas*,—and the Dutch, *eylaes*. A word of *pity*, when used of other persons. A word of *sorrow* and *concern*, when used of things.

Thus saith the Lord God; "Smite with thine hand, and stamp with thy foot, and say, *Alas!* for all the evil abominations of the house of Israel.' Ezekiel.

The word *wo*, is derived from the Saxon. And is an expression, denoting *grief*,—*sorrow*,—*misery*,—*calamity*, &c.

Wo is me for my hurt, my wound is grevious. *Jeremiah.*

It must occur to even a superficial observer, that the cause of our opponents is, in their own estimation, almost a *forlorn hope*; for those who would *revel* in *damnation*, and *riot* in *misery*, quietly to resign their *banquet*, and with a *single victim* attempt to *satiate* their *voracious maw*, is, at least, an *humble* acknowledgment on their part, that rather than give up their prejudices, they would retain them, if but *one* soul could be sacrificed on the altar of *their hopes*, and the blood of *one* victim *sprinkle* with unhallowed vengeance their *murderous* escutcheon!

Our opponents, to obtain any thing like evidence in favour of their hypothesis from our Saviour's declaration to Judas, *must prove*, that a *natural birth* or existence in this mode of being is absolutely necessary to an *existence in*, and *enjoyment of* heaven. This proved, and it would then be evident, that the *evils and pain* Judas suffered in this *life*, would be more than *counterbalanced* by the *joys* of heaven and *eternal life*; and that Judas had *better endure this*, than to have had no existence. This, however, if proved, would avail them nothing. Christ did not say, it would have been *better* for Judas if he had *never been born*,—Christ said, it *had* been *good* for Judas, if he *had not* (in the past tense) *been born*. If Judas had been *born* 600 years ago, which would have been 1200 years *posterior* to the time he *was born*, he could not have *betrayed* his Lord and Master. It is presumed, the *fact* will not be disputed, that nearly, if not quite *one half* of the human race *die in infancy*, and are, as respects their knowledge of God, or any thing they could do relative to *their* salvation, or any *part* they *take* in the *concerns* of this world, as though they had "*never been born*." How many infants die *immediately*, on *breathing* the air, and if it were necessary for them to *live* in this *mode* of *being* to fit them for heaven, is it not manifest, that their *existence* for the *moment*, and their creation, is altogether useless? It must be evident, even to a superficial observer, that the continuance of human life in this *mode* of *being*, is only to *prepare* a *body*; and the *fact*, that *one half* of our race *die* in *infancy*, is an unanswerable argument in favour of the declaration, that it would "have been good for Judas if *he had* NEVER *been born*;" but, like thousands, had never seen the light of this world. Had the mother of Judas been precipitated into the ocean, one day previous to the time of his birth, she would have been his grave; and *he* would have "been, (see Job, 3d chap.) quiet, he would have slept; and had then been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth," &c., where the "wicked cease from troubling," &c. Both Job and Jeremiah the prophet, cursed the day of their birth. "Wherefore, (says the prophet,) came I forth out of the womb to see labour and sorrow, that my days should be consumed with shame." No wonder that Christ, who wept over Jerusalem, should commiserate the situation of Judas, and say, *alas, poor man, good were it for him if he had not been born*. Solomon said, (see Ecclesiastes, 6th chap.) "If a man beget an hundred *children*, and live many years, so that the days of his years be many, and his soul be not filled with good, and also that he have no burial; I say, an untimely birth is better than he." Solomon was declared by God to be *wise*; his declaration, which we have quoted, was written for the use and instruction of mankind; and the *case* instanced is common to man,—for where shall we find a man, whose soul is filled with good? Even Job, and Jeremiah, according to Solomon, would not in their *own persons* have lost any thing, had they "*never been born*." And *Judas*, in a particular manner suffered, by *betraying* Christ. Solomon declares, that "all is vanity and vexation of Spirit;" and asks, "For who knoweth what is good for man in this life, *all the days of his vain life* which he spendeth as a shadow?" And Paul declares, "The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly," &c., and that "the creature SHALL be *delivered* from the bondage of corruption," &c. The *pre-existence* of *man* is a *fact*, which of *necessity* flows from the *premises* of our *opponents*, and they, with all their *orthodoxy*, cannot get by it. Deny this *conclusion*, and what will *you do* with *your premises*? Deny this conclusion, and you sap the very foundation of your hopes, and destroy your own systems! Adam, and Christ, are in the Scriptures put parallel; and it is declared, "For as in Adam all die,—even so in Christ shall all be made alive!" If you deny this, deny the whole, and prove to the world, that if you are culpable for your *infidelity*, you have at least *one claim*,—you are *consistent!* The most superficial observer on reading this 15th chap. to the Cor must see, that Paul *predicates* every thing relative to a *certainty* of *eternal life*, on the *resurrection of Christ* from the dead. And Paul declares, that Christ was seen after his resurrection, by more than five hundred at one time. Paul declares, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; *ye are yet in your sins!*" It is, therefore, the resurrection of Christ which justifies the world; agreeably to Paul's declaration to the Romans, that "he rose again for *our justification*." There is a fact stated, which *is true*,—our faith has nothing to do with *our* justification; for if our faith could justify, the fact of the resurrection of Christ would not have any thing to do with us,—and Christ *having risen*, we *are* justified, whether we believe it or not. Was Judas justified by the resurrection of Christ? If you say he had no *part* nor *lot* in the matter,—we answer,—"Jesus by the grace of God, *tasted death* for EVERY MAN!" If you say, the *sin* of *Judas* was *too great* to be *pardoned*,—we answer,—Paul declares, that he himself was the *chief* of *sinners*; that he persecuted the Christians *even unto death*; and Christ declared, "inasmuch as ye have done it unto them, my brethren, ye have done it unto me!" If it is objected, that Judas sinned and died, before the resurrection of Christ,—we answer,—"The blood of Jesus *cleanseth from all sin!*" The reader is requested again to attend to the declaration of Paul,—"For as in Adam all die, *even so* in Christ, shall all be made alive." *Even so*,—How? *Ans. Precisely* to the *extent* they died in Adam, shall *they* be made alive in Christ! *They*,—Whom? *Ans. All* who died *in* Adam! Did Judas *die in Adam?* Let Paul answer,—"The whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now!" If it is objected, that by dying *in* Adam, *only* dying in *our own personal* earthly nature is meant, we answer,—the Scriptures inform us, "that death passed upon all men for that all *have sinned*," and to contend that the *infant* of *one minute* of age, who only *breathes*, and *groans*, and *dies*, is by its *own personal sins in the body*, identified with *guilt*, and subjected to *death*, is ABSOLUTELY FALSE! And it contradicts the unequivocal and positive testimony of Scripture, which says, "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while *we* were *yet* sinners Christ died *for us*." If we *were* sinners *when* Christ *died*, "1800 years ago,"—and if death *passed* upon *all* men, (not because they *would* in future sin, after they *are* born) for all *have* (in the past tense) sinned, we ask, is it not an outrage upon every principle of common sense, to deny the pre-existence of the soul? It is,—and the *conclusions* which are contended for by the world, would of necessity destroy our future existence; for, "*even so*," says Paul, shall they be made alive in Christ. Therefore, it follows, that if man had *no* existence or *being in*, and *with* Adam, in *his*, Adam's *sin* and *fall*,—they will have *no* existence or *being* in the *life* in Christ. And the absurdity is as great in *one* case as *the* other,—for to *die in Adam* without *losing* life, and to be made *alive* in Christ, without gaining life, is absurd beyond description,—and to *lose* life, without *losing* consciousness of that *mode* of being, or life, and to be *made alive*, without coming *to the consciousness* of the *mode* of being, or life, is equally absurd. Judas, therefore, was a sinner, before he was born *into* this *mode* of earthly existence in *his own* person, by which he betrayed Christ. And this restoration to a sinless state, is as certain, as the word of God can make it. The *declarations of Christ*, relative to the salvation of Judas, independent of any, and all other testimony, is incontrovertible,—nay more,—the man, let him be whom he will, who shall attempt to invalidate this testimony, destroys his own hopes of salvation; for if Judas is never to be restored, the evidences in favour of the salvation of others are invalidated also. This 26th chap. of Matt. which is considered to contain evidence of the eternal damnation of Judas, declares, that Christ sat down with the *twelve*,—"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed *it*, and brake *it*, and gave *it* to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave *it* to them, saying, *Drink ye* ALL *of it*; For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many (not for a few) for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom, &c. Then said Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad." We now ask, Did not Judas *eat of this bread*, and *drink of this cup*, and did not Christ declare, "This is *my body*, and this is *my blood*?" *Ans.* He did. And Christ likewise declared, see John, 6th chap. 54th verse, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Did not Judas eat? *Ans.* He did! His salvation, therefore, is secured by the positive declaration of Christ; "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away," said the Redeemer of the world! Heaven and earth, therefore, shall pass away, but the salvation of Judas is secured by the *word* which shall never pass away, but shall be fulfilled! Relative to the degree of criminality on the part of Judas, we think the world generally are too much prejudiced to give a candid hearing, or to decide with candour. There is a strange incongruity in the opinions of mankind, relative to the merits of the twelve disciples. Repentant *Peter* is *eulogized*,

and *his tears* are considered an indubitable proof of his *goodness*—while repentant *Judas* is *damned*, and his *indescribable*, and *insupportable* anguish, is produced as evidence of his *wickedness* and depravity. We believe that sacred nor profane history does not record one event, which is more *distorted* and misconstrued than the one in question. Such has been the blindness which prejudice has created, that the chief priests and rulers, who were the *real murderers* of Christ, have escaped with a *gentle reprimand*; while the *calumniated* Judas, the *only man* who had *courage* or *principle* sufficient to induce him to *appear for* the *defence* of Christ, and *testify* to his *innocence*, is loaded with invective, and crushed with opprobrium. Let it not be understood, that we are the eulogists of Judas. Let the conduct of the twelve disciples speak for themselves. The Scriptures shall decide, and give to every one his proper character. It is related, in the 14th chap. of Mark, 29th verse, and this 26th chap. of Matt. 35th verse, of Peter, that he told Christ, "Although all shall be offended, yet *will* not I!" And when Jesus said unto him, "Thou shalt deny me," &c. he spake more vehemently, "If *I should die with thee*, I will not deny thee in any wise. Likewise, so said they all." The Evangelists inform us, that the same Peter, and that very night too, denied Christ, and confirmed his denial with oaths. "They all forsook him and fled!!!" Where was Judas? Was he denying his Master? Let the Scripture speak for itself.—See Mat. xxvii. chap. 1st, and 3d ver. "When the morning was come, all the chief priests and elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death. Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when *he saw* (where was Peter and the other disciples in this moment of their Master's peril?) that he was condemned, *repented himself*, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, *I have sinned*, in that I have betrayed innocent blood. And they said, "What *is that* to us? See thou to *that!*" Let the calumniators of Judas copy his example; nay, more—let them *lay their hands* upon their breasts, and ask themselves, individually—Have I *repented and confessed my sins?* Have I returned all *my unjust exactions*, and not kept that which belongs to another? If not, *I* am *behind* Judas in *humility*, and *less just* than him!!! Judas did all he could to preserve the life of his Lord and Master; and it would be doing injustice to his memory, to say, that he would not have saved him, had it been in his power. *Alas!* for poor Judas, it would, indeed, "have been *good for him*, if he had not been born." And it is not only *uncharitable*, but *unjust* and *inhuman*, to brand him with appellations of ignominy and reproach, and let the real murderers of Christ go free. "They took counsel together against Jesus, to put him to death." Judas, the distracted, repentant Judas, took counsel with his heart, bleeding with affection for his Lord, to *save his life!* How great the contrast—how undeserved the blame! It is a *fact*, that not *one* of the disciples of our Lord *believed in him*, until after his resurrection. "They trusted it had been him (Christ) which should have redeemed Israel." See Luke, 24th chap. 21st verse. They even *disputed* among themselves, see Luke 22d chap. 24th verse, which of them should be accounted the greatest, in this temporal kingdom, which they supposed Christ was going to establish; and this at table, after receiving the *bread* and *wine* at his hands, of the intention of which, they were at the time perfectly ignorant. It has been well observed, that Judas, witnessing the power of Christ manifested in the miracles which he wrought, and believing that he could free himself from the power of the chief priests at pleasure, indulged an avaricious disposition, and, as he thought, at the expense of the chief priests; who would give him money for delivering Jesus into their hands, and they lose their money, &c. And this is more than probable, when it is considered that the power of raising to life the dead—feeding thousands upon provisions, which would not on common occasions satisfy 50 men—commanding the winds and waves to be still, and be obeyed. Surely this power was more than sufficient to subvert the efforts of a handful of soldiers, or even defeat the largest armies! One thing is certain; Judas had no intention of betraying his Master to the death—and when he found his life was in danger, the reflection that he had, though unintentionally contributed to this danger, filled him with insupportable anguish; and his conduct in this emergency, is an example of *faithful attachment* to his Lord, of *ardent devotion* to his cause, and a repentance, *sincere* as *destructive*, and worthy the *example* and *approbation* of a GUILTY WORLD!!!

Note.—It has been objected, that Judas *hanged* himself; and being a *self-murderer*, he, by his last act, derogated from his repentance, however sincere. To this, we answer;—The Scriptures *do not* say that Judas *hanged himself.* The translators of the Scriptures are the *authors* of this declaration; and their prejudices undoubtedly misled them. We have *two* motives for *clearing up* this question, *namely*—a wish to do *justice* to Judas, and free his memory from an *unmerited* obloquy,—and to show the *consistency* of the Scriptures, which this *erroneous* translation has *destroyed!*

Matt. xviii. 6.—"Whoso offendeth one of these little ones, &c., it were better for him that a millstone were *hanged* about his neck," &c. The word in the *original*, which is translated *hanged*, is κρεμασθη, (*suspended.*) In xxvii. chap. 5th verse, speaking of Judas, "And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and *hanged* himself." The word here translated *hanged*, is απηγξατο, (*suffocated.*)

In Luke xix. 48.—"For all the people were very attentive to hear him," in the original, εξεκρεματο, (*they hanged on him.*) xxiii. 39. "And one of the malefactors which were *hanged*," &c, in the *original*, κρεμασθεντων, (*suspended.*) Acts v. 30. "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and *hanged* on a tree;"—in the *original*, κρεμασαντες, (*suspended.*) Of Judas, i. chap. 18. "Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and *falling headlong*, he *burst* asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." The *original*, πρηνης, translated *headlong*, conveys the idea, that Judas, *leaning* forward, *lost* his *balance*, fell, and was broken with the fall—he *burst*—was *dashed* and *broken*. Is it reasonable to conceive, that the Evangelists should declare, that Judas *fell down*, if, instead of *falling*, he had been *suspended*, or *hanged?* They were not at a loss for *proper words* to express themselves, as the passages we have quoted prove, on other occasions. Therefore, Revelation, reason and charity, authorize this *conclusion*, and no other, That Judas, finding all his efforts to free his Lord and Master from the *murderous* priests and elders, and receiving from them a declaration, tantamount to a positive exposition of their cruel purpose, and finding that Jesus, either did not, or could not, save himself from them—his feelings *overpowered him*, and he *fell headlong*, either from the entrance into the *Temple*, or *Hall* of Justice, when he was returning. Probably, on "casting down" the money, &c., on coming out, he *fell* and *died!* It is remarkable, that the account in Acts, i. and 18, mention *Judas* as being the *purchaser* of the field, &c.; but the *original* will not justify us in supposing, that he was in any manner the *voluntary* cause of his *own* death. The field was purchased by order of the chief priests, for a *burial* place; and being purchased with money which was possessed by Judas, it was called his purchase; although it was not bought by him, nor by the priests, until after his death. We repeat it,—the phraseology is remarkable, and settles this question completely. For Judas, although described as *acting* in the purchase of the *field*, is *passive*, in the *cause* of his *own death!*

COMMUNICATIONS.

INFIDELITY CONSIDERED.

If it is taken for granted that man's organization is such, that he is capable of knowing things spiritual, as well as things temporal, let us ask ourselves, whether, from this construction merely, we can know any thing, either of temporal or spiritual things; that is, without having them applied to our senses? The answer will be, no. Then, in both cases, the point is settled, that, to have knowledge of the world, it must be derived by us through the medium of its spirit; and also, to have knowledge of God, who is a Spirit, it must be by, and through the medium of the same. Proof, "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." If this point is satisfactorily settled, we will go to the next. Admitting man to be thus far constituted, knowing nothing of the world, but by the spirit of the world; nor of God, but by his Spirit, can he have a revelation of the things of the world, without first having the spirit of the world; or a revelation of the things of God, without possessing the Spirit of God? Certainly not. For a relation might with as much propriety, be given to a dead man of the things of the world, as to a man destitute of its spirit. So likewise, a revelation concerning the knowledge of God, and his requirings of man, is unavailing, unless he is divinely animated or inspired by his Spirit.

Before we proceed to draw conclusions from these premises, let us inquire into the nature and office of these spirits. That of the *world* seems to be the *first*, that man as a mortal creature knows any thing of, and constitutes the first man, or Adam. His *first birth* or creation, is that of the earth, compounded of the elements, from whence he has his animal life. If it needs proof, we will mention, "*That is not first, which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual.*" And the office of this spirit is not merely to animate the body, as is common with other animals, but to answer a great and glorious purpose, by obedience to that Spirit of inspiration of the Almighty, which giveth it an understanding in the things of God, that it may thereby be regenerated and born again, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, even through the operation of the Spirit of God; it may be a partaker of His divine nature, so that this first spirit, or old man Adam, or earthly nature, may be put off; that is, brought into subjection to the new man, Christ Jesus, the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, a divine quickening Spirit put on, and hence, that which is earthly changed into the image of the heavenly, its only end of creation.

And that Spirit which is from God being in Scripture contradistinguished from that which constitutes the first Adam, is called the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, a quickening Spirit, &c.; whose office is that of *Redeemer*, to effect that change in the natural man, or first Adam, which will redeem him from his corrupt or earthly nature, into its own likeness. As saith Christ, I am the Light of the world. He that followeth me, shall have the light of life. And as saith the Lord by his holy Prophet, "I will also give thee for a Light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth."

Now, if this view of man is correct, that he is constituted of the *first* earthly spirit, and made a recipient of the *second*, which is heavenly and Divine, and that the *first* is to *serve* the *second*, that it may be regenerated and born again of incorruptible seed, and so made an heir of the kingdom of heaven,—I say, if this view is correct, let us pass on to consider the subject of infidelity.

A true believer in God is no infidel, but to whom this faith is wanting, it may be said, "*Thou art the man.*"

AN IMPARTIALIST.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

The observations of our correspondent, relative to the Spirit of God, in contradistinction to the spirit of man, *which is of the earth*, and the great and glorious purpose to be effected by God's Spirit, in the salvation of the world, &c., are certainly praiseworthy—we however remark, that his quotation, see 1 Cor. 15th chap. 46th ver. "Howbeit, that *was* not first which is spiritual," &c., is applied by Paul to the resurrection, &c. It is the *natural*, or corrupt *body*, which Paul describes as *natural*; and which is to be *raised* a *spiritual* body, which Paul describes as *spiritual*, &c.

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor,—Seeing the belief so stubbornly and so unreasonably persisted in, (I make no distinction between *Calvinism* and *Arminianism*, both according to my conceptions are alike *absurd* and *nonsensical*)that the Eternal Creator and Parent of man, will doom a portion of those to whom he has voluntarily given existence, to never-ending torment after death, I feel it incumbent on me to defend and vindicate his character, and his eternally good intentions towards every individual of the human race. Therefore, I hold that the *unchangeableness* and eternal perfection of God's *knowledge*, will for ever stand as an unanswerable demonstration that the Christian doctrine of *damnation* is an *absolute lie*, and entitled to no credit. I am not more firmly persuaded that there is a God, than I am, that the above proposition is true, and an undeniable reality. And what I shall advance in the following lines in support of it, I *challenge* all who credit so blasphemous and God-dishonouring a doctrine to disprove.

I therefore, thus commence,—God is an eternally *good*, *self-existent*, *unchangeable*, and *infinitely* wise Being,—Consequently, if he is infinitely *wise*, he can make no advancement in knowledge; and if he can make no advancement in knowledge, he is perfect in knowledge,—and if he is perfect in knowledge, he knows that an event will take place, before it does take place. He knows to-day, what will take place to-morrow. He has not to wait to be acquainted with events, till the revolutions of this earth make him acquainted with them, which is the only way in which man receives all his knowledge.

Therefore, the evident and indisputable inference is, that as God's knowledge is perfect, and his designs and intentions eternally consistent, he knew before he made man, whether he would act in time, so as to involve himself in never-ending torment after death, or not. And if he did absolutely *know*, that man by his *acting*, in *time*,would *involve himself* in never-ending torment after death,being Almighty, and acting by his own free uncontrolled will, I ask, Why did he create him? In answering this question, God must be made an eternal tyrant, or the doctrine of damnation an absolute lie! If, therefore, no Christian believer in God will attempt to prove him an eternal tyrant, I challenge (as above observed) all who believe in the doctrine of damnation, to prove that *one single* individual of the human race will be punished after death, on account of his actions in this life. I know this vindication will be answered,—but justly, and unequivocally, I am persuaded it can never be answered irrefragably. But am I so foolish as to believe, that people will give up the idea of the damnation of their neighbours,—why should they, when they think they find the Bible so full of *fire* and *brimstone*? But fortunately, the fire and brimstone they meet with in the Bible, they will never meet with in a future state. God is *not* the Being they take him to be.

Mr. Editor,—if you will give this a place in your paper, you will much oblige,

A Rationalist.

CONTROVERSIAL.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

I feel myself much obliged to you, for publishing my communication; but my remote situation, distance from the post office, and from the residence of my friend that hath favoured me with most of the numbers of the Herald which have appeared, hath prevented me from answering your remarks in due time. And to me they are not quite satisfactory, because ye have not informed in your remarks upon my communication, whether ye believe the descendants of Adam are guilty of his sin, or, in other words, contaminated with his guilt, or with a seed of sin, propagated from him to his posterity in such a manner, as to render them sinners, or place them in a greater capacity of sinning. Ye have only traced original sin to the devil, and informed that he is author thereof; which I do not dispute. Neither have you requested me to confirm my first opinion, mentioned in my communication, namely,—we have lost nothing by Adam's transgression,—the necessity of first settling this subject I then saw, and yet see, for it is absolutely necessary to know what we require a Saviour for, before we investigate his mission to see whether it is conditional, or unconditional. For if it is your opinion, that Christ came to restore us from the fall and guilt of Adam's transgression, all that you can say respecting the attributes of God, and the divine qualities of his nature, in favour of the doctrine of Universal salvation by Christ, will apply with equal force against the doctrine of hereditary guilt; for when ye have enumerated all you know respecting the attributes of God, and his infinite power, and applied them with all the force and energy that is within the sphere of human reason, in favour of the doctrine of unconditional restoration from the fall of Adam by Jesus Christ, those very attributes will speak in as loud a manner, and declaim with equal authority, against the doctrine of hereditary guilt. For if the attributes of the Deity will not suffer him to let any perish in consequence of Adam's transgression, the same attributes would sooner have prevented the transgression itself. This is plain unto every philosophical mind; but to render it more plain, I will illustrate it by a figure.

The attributes of God would sooner have prevented poison from being infused into the cup of which Adam drank, by an arbitrary and tyrannical exertion of his power, than by an arbitrary and despotical surgical operation through the medium of Jesus Christ, to destroy the effects thereof in him and his posterity. Now if you believe with me, that we are *not* contaminated with the guilt of Adam's transgression, you cannot devise means for a Saviour to be applied unto mankind in any other sense, than that of a *seed*, by which *generated* Adam is *regenerated*; and if this will involve *questions* and contradict *testimony*, (as you have remarked,) be pleased to show wherein; and if ye say, that we require a Saviour to restore us from hereditary guilt, I pledge myself to refute this opinion, by the authority of the sacred writings. If you say with me, that we require a Saviour to regenerate us out of the image of our *first earthly nature*, which *is good*, is its proper sphere, into the image of God the Divine Nature, which *is holy*, I am of a mind, that I can prove this to be conditional, with which the Scriptures are replete. Is it not the language of the Scriptures that *man*, in his *origin*,does *not* possess the *image* of God? For we are told, that before the creation of the earth, it was without form, and *void*; that man, with every living creature, was made of the earth, and all pronounced equally good. Will *Adam* be saved in consequence of his being pronounced good? Surely not. For the *birds* of the air, and the *beasts* of the field, were equally as good; and created of the same substance. Adam was *first* created of the *earth*, male and female created he them, and called their name *Adam* in the day that they were created; which signifies *earthly*; the *first* man is of the *earth*, earthy, and speaketh of the earth. The question is, how did Adam obtain the image of God? *Ans.* By regeneration effected through the medium of Jesus Christ, the King eternal, immortal, who only hath immortality, who is the Word of God, and with God in the beginning.—a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, who laid down his Divine life in Adam. Adam *denied* his *first* animal life; suffered this *seed*, or *word*, to operate upon his soul, by which the life of God, or image of God, was generated and breathed in him. But *before* this Divine image was brought to *perfection*, he transgressed; turned the grace of God into wantonness; the Divine image died, was *decomposed* under the pains of hell or flaming sword,—there, then, *remained nothing* but the earthly image, which was dust; and unto dust did return; and this dust unto the eternal voides of utter darkness. In like manner, has Christ died, and laid down his life in every man under heaven. *He* is *called* a pearl of great price in *every man's* field. *This is the condition, sell all that thou hast, and purchase it*;—that is, part with thy *first birth*; deny thy first life. For if the worm does not part with its first birth, it never can witness the second birth in the image of the fly, by regeneration. He also offereth himself as the bread of eternal life; this is the condition,—*eat thereof*, that thou mayest live for ever. Again, "Labour for the meat that endureth unto everlasting life." Again, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." And again, "Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The *first birth* is positively declared to be *earthly*, and perishable; the *second*, heavenly and incorruptible. For there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body; but that was not *first* which is *spiritual*; but that which is natural, and afterward, that which is spiritual. Now, who are they that enter with Christ into the kingdom by the second birth? *Ans.* "Ye that have followed me in the regeneration did all comply with the condition. Did he not weep over Jerusalem, saying, "How often would I have gathered you, &c. but ye would not?" Much more might be added, but I must proceed to answer some of the most striking remarks of my an agonist. First, you say, that "If man's salvation is *conditional*, and that man can *do nothing* towards his salvation, involves it the strange absurdity of a *cause*, which can produce *no effect*?" *Ans.* This is good logic. But I have not said, that man can do nothing towards his salvation. I say, that man was placed upon the earth to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling. "Faith without works is dead:" Are not these conditions? If we hear Christ's sayings, and do them not, will not our building come to desolation? Again, if we do them, shall we not be likened unto the wise man that built upon a rock? Again,you reply, "To say that salvation is conditional, and that man *can* do something, and help to save himself, is taking the glory of salvation from God, and assigning it to man." *Ans.* It contributes more unto the glory of God, to hold forth the gift of eternal life unto all mankind, inviting them by the *alluring enchantments of celestial nature*, to come unto the royal banquet, and upon these easy conditions, *only* to put *on a wedding garment*, and *trim* their *lamps*, than by a despotical and tyrannical exertion of unlimited power, to force it upon them. Without me, says Christ, ye can do nothing. I, saith Paul, can do all things through Jesus Christ, which strengtheneth me. And further Paul saith, "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

Dean.

ANSWER.

The immediate reasons assigned by *Friend Dean* for his dissatisfaction, which he expresses at our *answer* to his *first* communication, are of a very *novel* complexion—*namely*, "because ye have not informed in your remarks upon my communication, whether you believe that we, the descendants of Adam, are guilty of his sin. Ye have *only* traced original sin to the devil—neither have you requested me to confirm my first opinion, &c., *namely*, we have lost nothing by Adam's transgression," &c. To this we answer; our correspondent, by looking at his first communication, will find, that he requested us "to inform him what are our sentiments respecting *original sin*, and to give our reasons, *or* inform him, whether we would *receive*, and publish *his*," &c. In addition to *our* remarks on *original sin*, we informed him, that his communication should be "published with candour," &c. We did not think it necessary to *request* him to *do* what *he promised*; we took it for granted that *he* would, to use his own expression, "clear away the rubbish," and we promised, likewise, to lend a hand. Relative to the mission of Christ, we believe he came to "*save* his people from *their* sins—to *save* the *world*!" Now if his *people's* sins are *Adam's* sins, we believe the *Saviour* was *necessary* to *restore* us from the *guilt* of Adam, —but not without. What Friend Dean has written respecting the *attributes* of Deity, &c. relative to preventing the fall of Adam, we think, is at least, in *this stage* of the *controversy*, in want of a *little* evidence to prove it to be relevant to the subject under discussion. First *prove* the premises—*then* draw conclusions. It appears to us, that Friend Dean has *shifted* his *dress* since he wrote his first communication. See Number 19, page 78, 2d column, "For I, says Friend Dean, do sincerely believe, &c., *second*—that Adam and all his posterity were *created*, and *born* under the *necessity* of a Saviour, to regenerate them *out* of the *image* of Adam, or *earthly* nature, *into* the *image* of God, the *Divine* nature. And the Saviour

is the *seed*, by which *generated* Adam is *regenerated*. And this seed was offered unto Adam and all his posterity, to *receive*, or *reject*, at *pleasure*." Now, Friend Dean says, "If you believe with me, that we *require* a Saviour to regenerate us *out* of the *image* of our *first earthly* nature, which *is good*, is its *proper sphere*, into the *image* of God, the Divine nature, which is *holy*, (Quere If man *was made good*, and in his *proper* sphere, if he is *altered*, he *must* be *bad*, and in an *improper* sphere!) I am of a mind, that I can prove this to be *conditional*, with which the Scriptures are replete." Pray how is this? *Good* men *requiring* a Saviour, to save them from their *proper* sphere—*good* men *altered*, and that alteration proceeding from a *necessity* beyond their control, and *anterior* too, to their existence, and this *necessity*, itself, conditional as to its *quality*, depending on the *pleasure* of men, and their salvation *conditional* too, when its *necessity* existed *prior* to their existence? Why, Friend Dean! Where art thou? Surely the Scriptures, which declare that "Man was *made upright*, but sought out *many inventions*," justify the conjecture, that thou art verily bewildered in a *maze* of *inventions!* What, we ask, could Friend Dean intend by the following interrogatory —"Is it not the language of the Scriptures, that *man*, in his *origin*, does (or did) *not* possess the *image* of God? For we are told, that *before* the creation of the *earth*, it was *without* form, and void; that *man*, with every living creature, was *made* of the *earth*, and all pronounced equally *good!*" We declare, that we do not admit this as evidence, for *two* reasons—*first*, it is contrary to the Scripture; for the Scripture does not say that God pronounced "*every* living creature *equally* good,"—but the Scripture *does say*, that God *made man* in his *image*. See Gen. 1. chap 26, and 27th verses. *Second*—The reason assigned by our correspondent is very *unreasonable*; for "we are told, that *before* the creation of the earth, *it* was *without* form, and void," &c. Now, if Friend Dean could *prove*, that *man* was *made* of the *earth* before the *earth* was *created*, and while it was *without* form, and void, we think there would be a *little* reason in his hypothesis; and if he could *prove*, that *man* was "*without* form, and void," *after he was made*, there would, we think, be a *great* deal of reason in *his* hypothesis, and very *little* in the *Scriptures!* This, however, he has not been able to do. Our correspondent's next interrogatory, is, in our opinion, clearly an *illegitimate* production—"Will Adam be *saved* in consequence of his being pronounced good?" He answers, "*Surely not*"—true, nor *damned* neither! He again interrogates—"The question is, *How* did Adam *obtain* the *image* of God?" and answers, "by *regeneration*, effected through the medium of Jesus Christ," &c &c. But, wonderful to relate, "*before* this *Divine* image was brought to *perfection*, he transgressed; turned the *grace* of God into wantonness, (*Quere*. Is the *grace* of God the *image* of God?) the *Divine image* was DECOMPOSED under the *pains* of HELL!!!" We *regret*, very much, Friend Dean, that you did not *inform* us, how you *became possessed* with this information! Our correspondent certainly has claims to *originality* of *expression*, if not to *correctness* in *sentiment*. We really do not know how to proceed,—this is a *new* case, and is altogether *out* of our *line!* And unfortunately, too, *for us*, the Scriptures do not say any thing about this matter; and, on the whole, we are constrained to declare, that this is the *strangest decomposition* we ever heard of. What! *Hell* a *menstruum*---the *earth* a *crucible*---and the *image* of *God*, IN IT, undergoing a *chemical process*, and suffering solution? INEXPRESSIBLY WONDERFUL!!! Reader, *More* wonderful still---for according to our correspondent, "there then *remained* NOTHING but the *earthly* image, which was DUST!" And this dust, according to our correspondent, was *without form*, and *void!* "And this *dust returned* unto the *eternal* voides of *utter darkness!*" DREADFUL! DREADFUL! "In *like manner*, has Christ *died*, and laid down *his life* in every man under heaven."---TERRIBLE! TERRIBLE! TERRIBLE!

We sincerely *doubt*, whether our correspondent made use of his reason when he wrote his communication. And nothing can be further from us, than an intention to offend by this declaration. Language is incompetent to express one half our astonishment at such STRANGE premises and conclusions. We think it unnecessary to discuss any further this singular production, than to observe, that *declarations* without *proof*, of the complexion of the following, can be of no advantage to the WRITER, or READER. "He, (Christ,) is called a PEARL of great price in every man's field," &c &c. &c.

Remarks on Hebrews, x. 9, 10.

"Then said he, Lo, I come, to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second, by which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*." Here is a positive declaration, that we are sanctified, the manner of which is explained,—the time is specified, for it was when the body of Christ was offered. And it is declared, that we are *sanctified by* the *will* of *God*. And Paul corroborates this, in the 14th verse, "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that *are* (not those who will sanctify themselves in future) sanctified." Let unbelievers, who contend that mankind are *not created anew in Christ*, look at this,—we are holy and without blame in him,—not in ourselves. When was the body of Christ offered? *Ans.* "1800 years ago," on Calvary! Who composed the body of Christ? Paul says, "Be it known unto you, that Christ is the Head of every man,---we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones,"---and Christ said, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." And Paul declares, in this chapter, "*Whereof*, the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us; for after that he had said before, This *is* the covenant that I will make with them; After those days, saith the Lord, I WILL put MY LAWS into their hearts, and in their minds WILL I write them,---And their sins and iniquities will I REMEMBER NO MORE! Put your finger on the condition, if there is a condition,---tell what it is, and call it by name!

"How long ye simple ones will ye love simplicity, and scorners delight in scorning, and fools hate knowledge?"

Objection Answered.

The Divinity of Christ has been objected to, and the declaration, Mark xiii. 32, is brought forward in support of that objection. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father." This clause (*neither the Son*) is *wanting* in Matthew and Luke, and Ambrose says, it was *wanting* in some *Greek* copies in his time. It is, therefore, more justifiable to suppose this is an interpolation, than to suppose Christ ignorant of the happening of an event, which was predicted by Daniel, who fixed the very year, 500 years before it happened. A contrary supposition would contradict the whole tenor of Scripture, and go to prove the declaration, that "in Christ dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily," to be false. The Scripture declares, that "The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy;" consequently, he knew of the happening of every event which he testified of, whether of *time*, or *eternity!*

Salvable Condition.

This phrase, we believe, is considered by all lexicographers, to mean a *condition*, or *state*, in which "salvation is possible." The Scriptures declare, that "all things are possible with God." Consequently, mankind universally were in a "salvable condition," before Christ came, and suffered, and died! Therefore, if Christ's obedience, sufferings and death, did not save men, he came in vain; for if it had been impossible to save men, he would not have attempted it; and if it was possible for him to save them, they were in a "salvable condition" before he came; and *his coming*, made that which was possible, CERTAIN!

Note. If any other conclusions can be deduced from the above premises, we should be very glad to see them!

Singular Evasion of the Truth.

Dr. Clark, in his remarks, relative to Judas, acknowledges it to be a matter of great difficulty, and confesses that he has his doubts, &c.; and only thinks that certain ways of explaining the passage appears plausible. This is as far as the Doctor could get. He, however, concludes his remarks, with the following opinion of Dr. Lightfoot,—who believed, "That the devil caught him up into the air, strangled him, and threw him down on the ground with violence, so that his body was burst, and his guts shed out."

Quere. How strong must that man's prejudices be, who would receive this ridiculous opinion, and prefer it to the truth?

EXTRACT *from a letter, written by* JOHN CALVIN *in* 1561, *to the* MARQUIS PAET, *high Chamberlain to the* KING *of* NAVARRE.

"Honour, glory, and riches, shall be the reward of your pains, but, above all, do not fail to rid the country of those scoundrels who stir up the people to revolt against us. Such monsters should be exterminated, as I have exterminated Michael Servetus the Spaniard."

Quere. How was Servetus exterminated? *Ans.* He was burned at the stake!!! Calvinists,---Look at your prototype!

REMARKS ON MATTHEW, i. 21, 22, 23.

"*And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS; for he SHALL save his people from their sins. (Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name IMMANUEL, which, being interpreted, is, God with us.*")

The advocates for conditional salvation, are requested to examine this passage, and point out the condition; for if there is a condition, it can be pointed out. The mission of Jesus is plainly stated,—he came to save his people,—and it is declared, emphatically, "SHALL save his people from their sins" His salvation, is the salvation of God; for it is added, his name "Immanuel, is, God with us." We, therefore, appeal to the conscience and reason of the reader, whether it is possible for this declaration to be truth, provided it is conditional with his people to be saved, and the condition is any exercise on their part, whether bodily, or mental, which they may, or can neglect, and in consequence, never be saved? You must answer, no! Who are his people? *Ans.* The 'Heathen are his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth is his possession. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. Know ye that the Lord, he *is* God; he hath made us, and not we ourselves; *we are* his people, and the sheep of his pasture. Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, *and* into his courts with praise: be thankful unto him; *and* bless his name (Why bless his name, and be thankful? *Ans.*) For the Lord *is* good; his mercy *is* everlasting; and his truth *endureth* to all generations."

To Correspondents.

A. B Is received, and will be published in our next.

All communications forwarded the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICES.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

Those persons who reside at, or in the vicinity of Norwalk, Conn. who wish to become subscribers to this paper, are informed, that Mr. Noah S Bailey, of Norwalk, will receive subscriptions, and supply them with the Numbers from the commencement &c.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1820. NO. 24.

The purposes of God are revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(*Continued from page* 66.)

The word *elect*, is next introduced by Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, 3d chap. 12th verse. It is remarkable, that the apostle in his preaching, notwithstanding he sometimes speaks of the elect, never says one word about a non-elect, who are to be made endlessly miserable. There is evidently an astonishing difference between the preaching of Paul, and the modern pretenders to divinity. We think this 3d chap. to the Col. contains truths, which must be very unpalatable to our modern disciples of Calvin; and if compared with their sermons, they must suffer amazingly by the comparison. The contrast is as great, as the difference between truth and error, light and darkness. In the preceding, the 2d chap. the apostle declares to the Colossians, that they are complete in Christ. He informs them, that they being dead in their sins, are quickened together with Christ, and that all their trespasses are forgiven unto them, &c. Paul commences the 3d chapter, by telling them, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." "Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth." And assigns as a reason for their doing this, that "they are dead, and their life is hid with Christ in God." There is a remarkable consistency in the preaching of Paul. Paul's doctrine was, "that the goodness of God leadeth to repentance." And we find him steady to this truth, "as the needle to the pole." After cautioning them, not to walk after the sins of the world, which they once did, &c., he says, "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him." What, we ask, is this *image*? Paul answers: "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond *nor* free; but Christ all, and in all." This is the *image* of the *new man*, and the Creator of this *new man*, is God; who makes all things *new* in Christ; in whom "there is neither Greek, nor Jew," &c. Paul then adds, see 12th verse, "Put on, therefore," (wherefore? *Ans.* There is no longer in Christ, either Greek or Jew, &c., all distinction is done away, and Christ the Saviour of all,) Put on therefore, as the *elect of God*, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, &c. even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye." But the *non-elect*, they are reprobate; eternal misery is their portion,—they are not in Christ,—they have no *part* nor *lot* in this matter, *you alone* are beloved of God,—you *alone* are in Christ,—and when I tell you to *love one another*, I mean the *chosen few*, the *elect* brethren. This is *orthodox*,—this is *divinity*,—this is *excellent* preaching,—but, it is altogether *different* from Paul's doctrine. Paul did not say one word about a *non-elect*, &c., no, not a word,—and those who would find countenance and authority for this abominable hypothesis, must have recourse to Calvin and Hopkins; for Paul will give them no encouragement whatever.

The word *elect*, is next introduced by Paul, in his 1st Epistle to Timothy, 5th chap. 21st verse. In the preceding part of this chap. Paul instructs Timothy relative to the duties incumbent on him as a minister of Jesus Christ. The whole of this Epistle, however, is an address to Timothy, and is in the shape of a charge, given him by Paul, in which all the duties of a minister are explained and enjoined whether in regard to *doctrine* or *conduct*,—and Timothy is in an especial manner commanded by Paul, what to preach, and is in the 2d chap. "exhorted to pray for all men,"—and Paul encourages him to this, by declaring, "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth"—Paul explains how this salvation *was* effected, and all men *saved*, by declaring, that "Christ Jesus gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." When, therefore, *all men* come to the *knowledge* of the *truth* that they *are saved by* Jesus Christ, the *due time* will have arrived, and all creation will testify to its truth. Paul, continuing his advice and instruction to Timothy, in the 4th chap. informs him, that "this *is* a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation. For, therefore, we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is *the Saviour of all men*, especially of those that believe. These things command and teach." What! teach the doctrine that God is the Saviour of *all men*? Why that is Universalism,—What could Paul have meant? And *command* too, that it should be believed! In good truth, Paul, if you should come into the city of New-York, and preach, or *teach* and *command* this doctrine in these days, there are very few churches would receive you. But, were you to come here and preach, that God would not save *only ONE out of an hundred*, you would be received with *open arms* It is really astonishing, that mankind *love* the very sound of the words *damnation* and *misery*; and there appears to be an antipathy, common to a large portion of the community, to the words *salvation* and *happiness*. Let a man's colour, or shape, or *sect*, be what it may, if he happens to *dwell*, if only by accident, on the word *salvation*, he is at once *suspected*,—his orthodoxy is doubted, and he has no alternative, but to *damn others*, or be *damned himself!!!* Reader, this is *truth*, in a *plain* dress! And we appeal to your conscience, whether a minister would not be countenanced in this city, and in the world generally, who should declare, that it was the will of God that not *one* out of *ten* should *be saved*, and that Christ gave himself a ransom for *only* a *few*, a *part*, or *some* of *all* men! Would he not be *caressed* by *thousands*? And would not the *minister* who should *preach* and tell, that it "was God's will that all should be saved, &c., and that Christ gave himself a ransom for all," and that God's will would be done, and that "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion, with songs, and everlasting joy upon their head," Isaiah xxxv. 10. Would not he be stigmatized as an Universalist, and *hated* and *despised* by thousands? Yes, he would!

Among the many vain attempts which unbelievers have made, to reason away the declaration of Paul, that "God is the Saviour of all men," the conclusion of this verse, "especially those that believe," has been brought forward, and *pulled*, and *twisted*, and strained every way, and all to no purpose. O yes, says the objector, but it says, "especially those that believe." What does this mean? We answer,—no man is saved because he believes; his faith cannot save him. "Ye are saved by grace, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, 3d chap. 20th to 24th verses, says, "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; (if works cannot justify, they cannot save.) for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now, (When, we ask? Now,—Now,—) the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; *even the righteousness* OF GOD, by faith OF Jesus Christ UNTO ALL! and UPON *all them* that *believe*; for there is no DIFFERENCE; for all *have sinned*, and come short of the glory of God. Being JUSTIFIED freely by his grace, (who are justified? *Ans.* All men,—all men!!! How can this be? *Ans.* Because all have sinned alike; and the grace that would justify one, will justify all!) through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." Can language be plainer? We are justified and saved, by the redemption that is in Christ,—not in ourselves. Now, compare this with Paul's declaration to Timothy, the believer is saved in an especial manner, &c., still, God is the Saviour of all,—and Paul tells the Romans, the righteousness of God, &c., is UPON them that believe,—but it is UNTO, or for ALL, whether they believe or not,—and Paul assigns a good reason (but a very disagreeable one to our pious, good, elect, chosen few, folks) why it should be so,—"for there is no difference."—What! no difference, no difference did you say? No difference between *me* and the wicked! Vile aspersion! But so it is; you may rave and rage, and after all, *we*, on the authority of Paul, pronounce "THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE!!!" No! None! We ask, the objector, whether "the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ," is not of sufficient efficacy to save sinners? You dare not answer this in the negative! And if you answer this in the affirmative, you inevitably, and fully admit, not the possibility, bnt the certainty of the SALVATION OF ALL MEN There is no other alternative for you. You can remain silent, and say nothing,—but if you speak, out of your own mouth shall you be judged. It will not be necessary for us to condemn you,—you will be obliged to do this for yourself!

Relative to the *especial* salvation Paul speaks of, we think a figure, or simile, can be introduced, which will illustrate and explain it to the meanest capacity, &c. Previous to doing this, we observe,—there is a strange disposition in mankind, to pervert and misunderstand the word *especially*; and this too, when its meaning is obvious to every one; and the word itself, in common and constant application. Had you two loads of wood, one load lying on the walk, and the other over the curb-stone in the street, and were you leaving your residence in the morning, for the day, and did you give directions to your servant, "to carry all the wood, and pile it in your yard, and add, especially that which is in the street," and did you on your return at evening, find the wood remaining on the walk, and the wood which was in the street, alone removed,—and on asking the reason why your orders were disobeyed, should receive for answer,—O! you said especially that which was in the street. Would this evasion satisfy you, even in this trivial concern? No! It would not. you would reprimand your slothful servant,—"I told you to carry all the wood, and pile it all,—and especially to take that in the street, first, as most necessary to be removed first, from its exposed situation." This would be your reply, in this case.—Why, then, try to evade the salvation of God, and by a method too, which you would reprimand and condemn in your servant? One case may be instanced, to show in an effectual manner the truth of Paul's declaration, "God is the Saviour of all men, especially those that believe." There are 100 men in prison and in irons, in this city, and under sentence of death, which they believe will be executed on their bodies, the first day of January next. The chief magistrate of the State of New-York has ability and inclination to pardon them. The instrument containing their pardon from all their offences is finished, and is signed by this magistrate on the first day of October;—they are then saved by his grace or favour from death,—a messenger arrives in this city and proclaims (see 1st Epistle to Timothy, 2d chap. &c.) The governor "will have all the prisoners to be saved, and come to the knowledge of this

truth," (namely,—that they are saved,) the messenger is derided, as being the bearer of, or promulgating falsehood; and he adds (see 4th chap. 9th and 10th verses,) "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all your acceptations: For we labour and suffer reproach, (this is the reason why we are hooted at) because we trust in the Governor who is the saviour of all these prisoners, and if any of these prisoners believe my message now, they will experience an especial salvation from their fears and uncertainty; if they do not believe me, they will pass three months in distress and apprehension, &c. The prisoners doubt the truth of this good news,—Ah, say they, it would indeed be good news if true. Yes, say some of them, it only means a part of all, there is an elect, or chosen few among us, whom the Governor means to *save*,—now if I am one of the elect, says one of the prisoners, I am saved,—if not, I shall be *hanged!* Others say it is not so,—"we must work out our own salvation,"—Take my advice,—go sure,—be careful,—the Governor has a secret decree, and when the first of January arrives, you may be hanged! Take my advice,—it is good to doubt a little,—Yes, says another, the Governor is not so merciful as you suppose,—the whole prison is in an uproar! There is not one believer among them all! The messenger again reads the pardon—(see 3d chap. to Romans.)" We know that the laws of this State are binding upon all,—you all have sinned, and broken those laws,—therefore, your deeds not being conformable to those laws, it is impossible for any of you to be justified by them,—But now, the Governor's obedience, without yours, is manifested, and this truth is proved by the very law themselves, and by expounders of those laws; even the obedience of the Governor is by the authority and favour of the State, unto and for you all, in such a manner, that you now are, in his estimation, just as much the keepers of the laws, as though you had infringed them only in the smallest extent, and his obedience, (righteousness) is upon you, (you will experience the joys, which you would experience, had you been innocent, when you believe the Governor, &c.) all that believe this, &c., for you all have sinned, there is no difference in you, in the Governor's opinion,—and he has justified, and acquitted you all,—freely, by his grace, or favour! They all deny the messenger.—Some, however, think it is conditionally true,—others say there is a part of them who will be saved, and the remainder will be hung! and a few say, they dont believe a word of it,—if it was true, they would not disagree so much among themselves,—and some one of them not stopping at Deism, like a true Atheist, declares, that he does not believe there is any Governor,—as to the pardon, the messenger wrote it himself,—they got in the prison by chance, and they will get out, as they got in,—as for being hung, that is all a whim! In process of time, two or three believe the Governor's proclamation to be truth, and that "He is the saviour of all!" The others no sooner hear this declaration, than they turn these licentious Universalists out of the prison, lest they should be contaminated with their faith and practice!!! The Calvinists, Arminians, Deists, and Atheists, remain quarrelling and disputing,—burdened with irons, and dreading the halter! Reader, we appeal to you, for the correctness of this simile,—and farther, we ask you, if the faith of these prisoners was necessary to their pardon, and to prevent the execution of the sentence? No! It was not. By believing, they would enjoy their pardon; but they were pardoned, whether they would believe or not.

(To be continued.)

COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. EDITOR,—Enclosed you have the copy of a letter, addressed to a person who is halting between two opinions; and who, although she sees the inconsistencies in the faith she has professed, does not see sufficiently clear, to embrace the doctrine of the "*restitution of all things.*"

New-York, Sept. 1820.

DEAR MADAM,—

Perceiving that you have manifested an ardent desire to become in a greater degree acquainted with the truth as it is in Jesus, and that you are disposed to examine and investigate the subject, in a candid and unprejudiced manner, and having also heard you say, that the doctrine of the restitution of all things appears reasonable and consistent, I feel induced to throw together a few remarks on the subject, according as my ability will permit, for your consideration. And if, by the blessing of an ever gracious God, they may be made instrumental in revealing in a farther degree the truth to your mind, I shall consider myself amply repaid; if not, the consciousness of having acted from an upright motive will be gratifying, I shall rest satisfied, well knowing, that in the time which Infinite Wisdom sees good, you, as well as every other child of Adam, will see the truth as it is, believe with the heart unto righteousness, and see yourself as you are seen of God,—namely, accepted in the Son of his Love. Believing you are as ready to read, as I feel myself to write, further preamble is unnecessary.

In the first place, then, the salvation of all men follows as a natural and inevitable consequence, from the character of God; and when the unprejudiced mind is enabled to discern that character in a correct point of view, it is impossible to avoid the same conclusion. I believe that all sects and denominations whatever, who call themselves Christians, allow that God is infinite in wisdom, Almighty in power, and that his goodness and mercy is commensurate with either of the before mentioned perfections. This character must harmonize,—Let us beware, and not exercise *one* attribute, to the prejudice *of another*, thus setting the character at variance. Hence, we conclude upon the soundest principles of reason, that in the creation of man, infinite Goodness designed his never-ending happiness; for if any creature whom God has called into existence, endowed with the power of reasoning and discriminating between good and evil, is to be endlessly miserable, the attribute of *goodness* or mercy, in an unbounded sense, falls at once to the ground. For how can that be boundless, or infinite, if there be a single individual which it cannot reach? In the great work of creation, Infinite Wisdom also had a share, it foresaw with the utmost precision the means which should accomplish the designs of unbounded goodness; nor can all the efforts of men and devils united, prevent their use; for Almighty power will effectually use the means already marked out by unerring wisdom, to secure the happiness of the whole family of man. If any, or all these attributes, were less than perfect, or unbounded, we should indeed be lost in uncertainty and doubt; for though infinite *goodness* might will our happiness, there might not be *wisdom* sufficient to discern the means for accomplishing it; or were the *wisdom* sufficient, without *mercy*, it might be directed to some end, independent of our happiness, and leave us in such a condition that we might perchance be happy, or left to languish under evils, which the *wisdom* of Deity could find no means of averting. And was there *power* without *wisdom* and *goodness*, it might be exercised at random, marring the fairest works of creation, and acting, perhaps, like the merciless sword of the destroying foe, or the tomahawk of the infuriate Indian, which alike massacres the feeble infant, the helpless female, and infirm old age; instead of being the guiding and healing hand of an Almighty friend, actuated by the purest wisdom and goodness. Thus we clearly see the firm ground there is for consolation in this beautiful and consistent view of the character of God. On the other hand, we see the instability of any hope, founded on a character less than perfect,—an unforeseen contingency might disarange the plans of an imperfect being, and leave his creatures in doubt and uncertainty, as to their final destination. But thanks be to our Almighty, all wise, and all good Creator, we know his character to be the very perfection of excellence, the very essence of all that is good. And though to our circumscribed vision, there is much which appears as evil, yet we know, that it is the prerogative of Deity, to bring good out of "seeming evil." No contingency can frustrate his designs; for he foresaw the whole, and provided the means, which should effectually counteract them. "The chief end of man, says the assembly's catechism, is to glorify God and enjoy him for ever." Such was indeed the design of God in creation; his own glory, and the good of his creatures,—nor can all created beings, from the highest archangel in heaven's host, down to the feeble worm of the earth on which we tread, with all their concentrated forces, pervert or change his intentions. As God was in the beginning, so is he now, and ever will be,—HE IS LOVE. Whom once he loved, he loveth to the end; for with him there is no variableness, no, not even the shadow of turning. And "*he so loved the world,*" or all men, "that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." For this divine view of thy character, "Bless the Lord, O our souls, and all that is within us, bless thy holy name."

Having thus in a brief manner touched upon a few of the evidences, which may be adduced from the character of God, in favour of the salvation of all men, let us next, for a few minutes, attend to what we can find in his works, to favour the same sentiment; and I think if we may be allowed to reason from analogy, the evidences will be found striking and conclusive. That he has shed over the whole earth a rich profusion for the wants of every living thing, will need no written arguments to prove. Who that walks the fields, standing thick with corn, and the trees bending to the earth with the weight of their fruits,—who that even visits our markets, and at one view beholds every variety which the soil and climate produces, can doubt for one moment of the provident and continual bounty of the great Creator and Preserver of the universe? Let us then reflect, that according to Revelation, he has, for nearly six thousand years, caused the seed-time and the harvest yearly to succeed each other; for that space of time he has caused his rain to fall, and his sun to shine in their due seasons, thus causing the earth to bring forth abundantly year after year, and filling the heart of man with food and gladness. He has caused the sun, with the other planets, to know their appointed courses, causing our day and night, and fitly apportioning the time for alternate labour and rest. And for whom is all this? The answer is, for man,—for man, the highly favoured of heaven. Dominion hath been given over the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the fishes of the sea. For him has the earth brought forth of her abundant treasures; for him was ordained the seed-time and the harvest, the early and the latter rain. Now let us pause,—and ask ourselves, Will he who has been thus mindful of our temporal welfare, who has made such rich provision for the wants of the perishing body, which today is, and to-morrow must mingle with its kindred dust,—will he who has done so much for that which is comparatively of so little worth, will he for ever neglect the interest of the immortal soul, which being the breath of Deity, shall exist for ever, unmarred by the change which is to take place in this mortal body? No,—reason and revelation both forbid it. In proportion as the soul is more valuable and superior to the body, so in proportion are the blessings and enjoyments which the provident goodness of the Creator hath laid up in store for it. Superior to our temporal enjoyments, it was the image of its Maker. The dust shall return to its kindred dust, but the spirit shall soar triumphant, when disencumbered of its clay-built tenement, to the God who gave it, there to be restored to the similarity, which through transgression it had lost, and which it formerly bore to its divine Author. Let us now turn to the WORD of God, as written in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and see what we can there find favourable to the restitution of all things. It would take volumes to speak of all the evidences which are there to be found; I can, therefore, only notice a few of them. From the character of God and his works, we learn that he is abundant in goodness to the children of men. In his works we admire the *wisdom* which shines through all, in the harmonious manner in which all perform their respective parts,—and the *power* which for ages has sustained the mighty universe, where worlds and systems have been in perpetual motion, ever since the breath of Deity spake them

into being, one unbroken scene of harmony has pervaded the whole. Seeing all this, we conclude that men will be the final recipients of the greatest happiness; but of the means made use of to secure it for them, natural religion does not inform us. On this subject, the inestimable pages of Revelation has given ample instruction; has told us in what manner God "can be just, and the justifier of the ungodly." From Revelation, we learn that man was created upright. "In the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." For a time man retained his innocence, and consequently misery was unknown; he enjoyed his Creator's presence without a vail between, and in this communion, undoubtedly found joy unspeakable,---But how soon was the scene changed? The inveterate adversary of our nature, in the form of a serpent. was permitted, by his accursed deceit, to beguile our general mother. She persuaded Adam to partake of the forbidden fruit, contrary to the express command of his Creator, and thus incurred the penalty due to the transgression, death to himself, and through him to all his posterity. Then misery first entered this world, with all its train of concomitant evils; our first parents were then driven from their late happy abode, and were made to eat their bread in the sweat of the brow. And now was unfolded to them the first outline of that great plan of redemption, which none but a God could conceive, and none but a God could carry into execution. It is remarkable, that man was not cursed; but to the serpent he said, "Cursed art thou above all the beasts of the field, &c." And to man he said, "Cursed is the *ground* for thy sake." He was made to labour for that which the earth before spontaneously produced; but in the midst of these sorrows, the consequence of sin, there was a precious promise, "the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." Thus were they taught, when adversity first came upon them, that the evil should be surmounted, and they be restored to their former estate Had not some ray of hope been imparted, miserable indeed had been their situation,---deprived of the blessings of God's countenance, and their posterity condemned for their offence, it would indeed have been insupportable But we here see, that in the midst of wrath, our God remembers mercy. In process of time, we find the all wise Disposer of events, revealing the promise in a more clear and unequivocal manner to the patriarch Abraham, "saying, In thy seed shall all the families and nations of the earth be blessed." This was emphatically repeated to Isaac and Jacob, and confirmed to them by the very oath of Jehovah Amazing condescension! The Almighty God, Creator of heaven and earth, stooping to confirm his truth in the minds of his scarce believing children, by the sanctity of an oath; one too, who it was impossible should lie. We now come to a most interesting portion of Scripture, in the history of the twelve tribes, who are considered as figurative of all mankind, and who were about entering into their state of Egyptian bondage, which is typical of the thraldom of sin over the human family. We read of the misery and oppression which they endured from the cruelty of their task masters, and we see Moses, Aaron, and Joshua, after the miracles which God had wrought among them, in order to induce the Egyptians to let them go, conducting them with the high hand and outstretched arm of God for their guide, from this state of bondage and slavery, through dangers and perils the most eminent, to the land which God had promised their fathers, a land flowing with milk and honey, and finally giving them rest from their enemies round about; typical of that heavenly Canaan where our spiritual enemies can never come, where we shall have peace from them all, and where we shall arrive in due time, under the guidance of the Captain of salvation, Jesus Christ, of whom Moses, Aaron, and Joshua, were types. It is remarkable, that not one single Israelite was left in Egypt; good and bad without distinction were brought out, none were left to perish in their bondage; so Jesus Christ came into the world to "destroy death, and him who had the power of death, and to deliver those who were all their lifetime subject to bondage." All the ceremonies of the Jewish economy,---all the sacrifices and offerings point to the great sacrifice on Calvary, and these found their fulfilment in the sufferings of the Saviour of the world. The offerings and sacrifices under the Jewish dispensation, were offered year by year continually, but they could not make the comers thereunto perfect; for had that been the case, then would they have ceased to have been offered. Remembrance was made in them of sin every year; but now, in the end of the world, or at the close of the Jewish era, Christ offered himself a sacrifice for sin, the just for the unjust, that he might bring them to God; "and hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified; and now sits at the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Thus all these ceremonies pointed to Christ, and were fulfilled in him. The sins of the whole congregation were figuratively atoned for by the offerings made by the priests, and so the great High Priest of our profession, offered himself a Lamb, without spot or blemish, an atonement for the sins of the whole world. In the 3d Psalm it is written, "Ask, and I shall give thee the heathen thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth thy possession." To whom are the heathen given? *Ans.* To Jesus Christ, the Saviour of all men. "All souls, saith God, are mine," and the Son saith, "All thine are mine, and mine are thine." And we are taught, that the Father hath given all things into the hand of the Son: and that all who are given to the Son, shall come unto him. In the 22d Psalm, we are told, that "all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him." In the 67th Psalm, we are informed, that God shall bless mankind, and that all the ends of the earth shall fear him; and in that directly succeeding, we are told, speaking of Christ, that "he hath ascended up on high, leading captivity captive, and obtained gifts for men, yea, *even for the rebellious.*" And for what purpose? Hear! O heavens! and be astonished, O earth! "That God the Lord might dwell with them." We are told, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord;" it, therefore, follows, that before we are fitted to dwell in the presence of the Lord, our sinful dispositions must be destroyed, and we be made holy This is a consummation devoutly to be wished for, and it will take place; for speaking of men, God says by the prophet, "They shall be all righteous, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." In the 86th Psalm we are also assured, that "all nations shall come and worship before the Lord, and glorify his name." Our God has revealed himself to us under various names, but the most endearing is that of Saviour; it is above every name; in that name every knee shall bow; and to glorify it, will be to bear witness with our joyful tongues to the great salvation. In the 100th Psalm, all lands are required to make a joyful noise to the Lord; and the reason why it should be done is given, "because he is good, his mercy everlasting, and his truth to all generations." To conclude with the book of Psalms, in the 148th, every created thing, animate and inanimate, is called upon to praise the Lord. Kings of the earth, and all people, princes and all judges, young men and maidens, old men and children, all are required to praise him. And assuredly there must be abundant cause for their praise, else they would not be so earnestly and repeatedly called upon to render it. There is indeed cause.—He hath set Jesus to be his salvation to the end of the earth. "He tasted death for every man," and has redeemed us to God by his blood. We were dead in trespasses and sins, but are now made alive in Christ. Let us then, lift up our whole willing hearts in grateful aspiration of thanksgiving and praise, and say with the Psalmist, "Bless the Lord, O our souls, and forget not all his benefits; for he hath crowned us with loving kindness and tender mercies." John, in prophetic vision. saw the requirements of this Psalm performed, when he heard every creature in heaven, on earth. under the earth, them that are in the great deep. and all that in them are, saying, "Blessing and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever." In the 11th chap. of Isaiah, the Saviour is spoken of as the Rod which was to come forth out of the stem of Jesse; that the Spirit of the Lord should be upon him, the Spirit of wisdom, &c. &c. And his peaceful reign is there beautifully described, under the figure of the reconciliation of the antipathies of various kinds of ferocious animals, who are made to dwell in peace with the kid, the calf, the cow, the ox, &c., shadowing forth the destruction of the bitter passions and prejudices which agitate the breast of man. But they shall all come into the unity of the faith, and the bonds of peace shall encircle all. We are there told, that the *dispersed of Judah*, and the *outcasts of Israel*, shall be gathered from the four corners of the earth; that in that day, the root of Jesse shall stand as an ensign to the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious." In the 53d chap. we are informed, "he was wounded for our transgression," &c., that "all we like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," that "he hath put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, brought in everlasting righteousness, and made reconciliation for iniquity." In the 61st chapter it is written, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those that are bound." This portion of prophecy the Saviour expressly applies to himself, for the Scriptures being handed him, he opened to the place, read the portion, closed the book, sat down and said, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears."

And what were the good tidings which he preached? Salvation to men; he preached peace and healing to the broken-hearted; liberty to those whom Satan held captive, and the opening of the prison to those who were the bond-slaves of sin! He taught peace to the children of men, and equity in all their dealings; to forsake all their wicked ways,—and said to them, "Take my yoke upon you, for my yoke is easy, my burden is light." Yes, the service of such a Master is indeed perfect freedom; for he draws us by the soft and silken cords of love. Time would fail, to notice the numerous evidences of the extensive dominion of the Saviour in the prophecies. I have already written much more than I originally intended, and shall, therefore, close by noticing one or two from the New Testament. In the 1st chapter of Matthew, we are struck with the occurrence of the Angel appearing to Joseph, and instructing him what to name the young child—it was Jesus—and the reason is immediately added, "*for he shall save his people from their sins.*" The *name* of Jesus, is, I believe, but little attended to; the literal signification of the term, is *Saviour*, and it was given to the babe of Bethlehem, because it denoted the character he was to bear—he was to save his people *from* their sins. Who are his people? We have before seen, that the heathen was given him, his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth, his possession. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; and all that he hath, he has given to his Son. Every man, therefore, belongs to Jesus. His purpose was to save every man; and that purpose will be accomplished. John bore testimony to the divine mission of the Saviour, when seeing Jesus, he cried, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" He was the antitype of the lamb made use of by the children of Israel when the destroying angel passed through the land of Egypt at night, and smote all the first-born of the Egyptians The Israelites struck the blood of the lamb upon the door posts, and the destroying angel passed by when he saw it,---for there dwelt one of the seed of Abraham, one beloved of God. The flesh of this lamb was eaten, but not a bone of it was broken! So when our Saviour hung in agony on the tree, where our sins had transfixed him, not a bone was broken; and over him who is found sprinkled with the blood of this great Antitype, which was shed on Calvary, the destroying angel, or adversary of our nature, hath no power which can effect his final happiness; all mankind are sprinkled with it, for the blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin, and he was the "Lamb of God who

taketh away the sin of the world. He came to seek and to save that which was lost,—it was his meat to do the will of God." "All we," says the prophet, "like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. The Lord looked down from heaven, to see if there were any who had done good among men; but behold, they were all gone out of the way, had together become unprofitable, and there were none who done good;" all, consequently, were in a lost state; they had violated the law of God, and were liable to suffer the penalty, *death*. But Jesus Christ came "in the likeness of sinful flesh;" he sought them,—he found and saved; for "he tasted death for every man." It was the will of God that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth; his work was to do the will of God, and his last words were, "IT IS FINISHED."

The great Apostle to the Gentiles, as well as the others, bear ample and unequivocal testimony to the universal and unconditional salvation of the human family, by Jesus Christ. I would quote some of the most prominent parts, but you are as well acquainted with them as myself; it would therefore be useless. I think they only require to be read with attention, to convey to the unprejudiced mind a clear conviction, that God loves all his children with an equal love; though he may, for reasons known only to himself, vary his dispensations toward them. He has given his only begotten Son to suffer, bleed, and die for us, and O! is it reasonable to suppose, that he will withhold minor blessings?" No, it is not. He who freely gave up his Son to die for us, will also with him freely give us all things that our circumstances require. We are not at all times wise enough, to ask for the things which we most need; he in mercy bestows them unasked, and withholds that, which being asked, would, if granted, prove our bane. Are we afflicted? It is natural that we should mourn; but let us remember, that afflictions come from a Father's hand, "which wounds to heal, and who afflicts to bless." I have thus, as far as my ability would permit, endeavoured to bring forward a few of the evidences from the character, works, and word of God, to prove that the "doctrine of the restitution of all things," is clearly deducible from the two first, and as clearly taught in the latter; and that it is the doctrine which makes most for the glory of the great Creator. It is for yourself to determine, in your own mind, whether they are sufficient and satisfactory. I could wish that an abler pen had undertaken it; such as it is, however, I submit it to your inspection, soliciting your charity for all deficiencies. If the truths (as I humbly conceive them to be,) contained in it, shall afford you at any time as much consolation and joyful hope, as they have me, I shall thank God, for having been partially instrumental in conveying the light of truth to one mind. That you may be enabled to see the divine consistency of the word, in teaching the universality of the great salvation, is the sincere desire of your friend,

A. B.

Note. The declaration of our correspondent, see page 99, first column, 42d line from the top, "Had not some ray of hope been imparted, miserable indeed had been their situation,—deprived of the blessings of God's countenance, and *their posterity condemned* for *their* offence," &c. Now, we are not surprised at seeing this error admitted, and even by those, too, whose conclusions very happily destroy their premises. Such is the force of habit, and the strength of controlling prejudices, the fruits of early and wrong impressions. We presume, our correspondent will be ready and willing to correct this, in our opinion, inadvertent error. If Adam's *posterity* was really *condemned* for *his* offence, we think it would be as difficult to maintain the character of the *justice* of God, as it now is, to support by any thing like *proof*, this *strange hypothesis!*

CONTROVERSIAL.

For the Gospel Herald.

The Editor hath declared as follows; "God is a free-agent; therefore, man could not be made in the *image of God*, without being a free-agent likewise, free-agency, uprightness, and to be in the image of God, are *convertible* terms." "Is it not certain, that they (mankind) lost *their image of God*, and that the *new creation in Christ* restores *every man!*" "What appears to Philotheus to be the new birth, &c., is, in fact, nothing more than a man's coming to the knowledge of the truth, that he is created anew in Christ Jesus." Page 60, 76. In page 77, speaking as if we of this day were in Christ; and I have often understood him, as believing we were all created anew in Christ 1800 years ago; (see page 35.) he says, "If man was not circumcised, baptized, buried, *quickened*, and *raised in*, and with Christ, 1800 years ago, there is no meaning in language." 41. page 45. "It should never be forgotten one moment that we are created anew IN CHRIST." And p. 36. "all men are created anew in Christ, and saved agreeable to God's will, and *sit in heavenly places* in Christ Jesus." In p. 38. he adds, Jesus "died to save his people from, not in, their sins." In p 41. "What is the meaning of the word justified? It is to be pronounced innocent and free from guilt. Did Christ make man innocent and free from guilt? Yes. Ye are complete in him, &c."

Who, after reading these and similar expressions of the Editor, could suppose I misunderstood him, in believing that he allowed men were free-agents? Here he plainly asserts, 1. that God made man a free-agent, *in his own image*; 2dly, that the new creation in Christ, restores every man, who lost God's image and free-agency; and that it ought never to be forgotten, one moment, that we are created anew in Christ, (who is the image of God, Col. i. 15.) Hence it follows, that, if all men are (as the Editor asserts,) created anew in Christ Jesus, the image of God, all are restored to him and his image, and consequently, to free-agency and uprightness; free-agency, uprightness, and the image of God, being "convertible terms." And that man is restored to uprightness, is asserted, by his saying, we are created anew, (i. e. anew in God's image) in Christ Jesus, and saved from, and not in, sin: and are justified; i. e. made innocent and free from guilt, and are complete in Christ, in whom he supposes all mankind are; sitting in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. For all were not only circumcised, baptized and buried in, and with Christ Jesus, but were quickened, and raised in, and with him, about 1800 years ago, &c.

After such declarations, that favour free-agency in man, when first created, and 2dly, when created in the image of God, and restored to that which he lost in the fall; the Editor, in Herald, Number 22, now expressly asserts, that we are not free-agents.

All I have now to say, is, that I really understood him to be a believer in the doctrine of free-agency; and of accountability, if a believer of man's free-agency. How the Editor can reconcile the above declarations, with the idea that man is not a free-agent now, though complete in Christ, in whom the Editor thinks all men are, is a mystery. I have not intentionally misunderstood the Editor; though I believe he has intentionally, ungenerously, and shamefully abused the intention, spirit and purport of what I have written. Such conduct of the Editor is unpleasant to me, and must, I think, be so to his readers. Therefore, unless he promises to act more like a gentleman, and a Christian, I decline continuing my answers, which his two last communications have interrupted.

PHILOTHEUS.

ANSWER.

If Philotheus had quoted a *little more* from our 60th page, we think any further answer on our part would have been unnecessary. In the 3d column, 16th line from the top, he may find the following,—"We, therefore, consider the question in this light, *As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.* If Philotheus believes this to be truth, he must acknowledge, that as many as died in Adam shall be made alive in Christ. We have the testimony of Paul, that *we are dead, and our life is hid with Christ in God*; and of John, that *we have eternal life in the Son of God.*" Reader, here is our exposition of what Philotheus is pleased to call the Editor's professed *belief* in *free-agency*; by examining the remainder of the 3d column, the reader will see, that the time we referred to, was the resurrection, agreeably to Paul's account in the 15th chap. 1 Cor. Philotheus' quotation from our 76th page, 3d column, 33d line from the bottom, was, on our part, a recapitulation of what we urged in our former answer to him, &c. Namely, "Is it not certain that they lost their image of God, and that this new creation in Christ, who is the head of every man, restores every man?" Reader, is it not astonishing, that after all our expositions, in which we have again, and again, informed Philotheus, that this NEW *creation* is IN *Christ*, and NOT IN the CREATURE, and in this very column, only seven lines above this quotation, we asked, "Is it possible that Philotheus is so stupid, that he cannot see any difference between Christ's being born, or created anew in us, and our being *created anew* IN *him?*" It is indeed astonishing, that Philotheus should persist in misunderstanding us, even when we declared in the page from which he made his quotation, that "*we are dead*, and *our life* is hid with Christ in God." Philotheus concludes his quotations, by asking, "Who, after reading these, and similar expressions of the Editor, could suppose I misunderstood him, in believing that he allowed men were *free-agents?*" Now we ask, "Who after reading our declaration, in this very 60th page, 2d column, from which Philotheus' quotations are made, namely, "There is none that understandeth,—they are all gone out of the way, &c., there is none that doeth good, no, not one! We now ask Philotheus, and we hope he will answer, whether a man, who has *no understanding is a free-agent?*" We have seen the manner in which Philotheus has answered, or rather, evaded an answer to our questions. Philotheus thinks it a mystery, how we can reconcile our declarations with a denial of free-agency. We answer,—we have found no difficulty whatever as yet,—it is Philotheus who finds difficulty, and we think he will find a great deal more, if he keeps on in his old style of evasion! We, therefore, declare, once for all,—"WE *are created anew* IN *Christ*,—NOT IN OURSELVES." In answer to the conclusion of Philotheus' communication, we would only remark, that we are sorry *on his account* that he is "*angry without* cause." In the words of the apostle, we advise him to be angry, and sin not; and not to let the sun go down upon his wrath. The condition, and which we presume is a *sine qua non*, on which he will renew his correspondence, is very ambiguous. We assure him, that it shall be our constant endeavour to "act more like a Christian" than we have ever done,—but, except Philotheus shall act like a Christian also, and no longer *equivocate* and *evade*, we cannot promise to be more "*gentle.*"

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—Having never seen a commentary, which in my opinion gave a satisfactory solution of the parables of the *unjust steward*, and the *rich man* and *Lazarus*, contained in the 16th chap. of the Gospel by Luke, and having seen in the Gospel Herald, several comments on what are called difficult passages of Scripture, which I consider evincive of an enlightened understanding in the manifold wisdom of God, which is made known unto the church;—you will particularly oblige a reader of your paper, by giving your opinion on the above parables, &c.

H.

Note. Agreeably to the request of our correspondent, we shall commence an exposition of the abovementioned parables, in our next Number.

NOTICES.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

Those persons who reside at, or in the vicinity of Norwalk, Conn. who wish to become subscribers to this paper, are informed, that Mr. Noah S. Bailey, of Norwalk, will receive subscriptions, and supply them with the Numbers from the commencement. &c.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1820. NO. 25.

An Exposition of Luke xvi.

The Parable of the unjust Steward.

Among the strange inconsistencies which characterize *Theologians* at the present day, there is not a greater, than their distinctions *in*, and expositions *of* the *parables* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The *Mission* of Christ, was the salvation of the world. He had no *little* end in view; and his declarations generally, were connected, and had a distinct and pointed reference to his *mission*, and the work he came to perform. The method by which he effected this great end, and the manner in which it should progressively be manifested to mankind, and the different estimation in which mankind should view this work of salvation, and the consequent difference in the temporal state of the Jews and Gentiles, which should result from God's providence, in his governing and redeeming his creatures in a manner which should redound to his glory, and their happiness, was made known by Christ to his disciples, and addressed to them in *parables*. The reason for this is obvious.—"Christ came, not to destroy the law, or the prophets, but to fulfil the law," &c. And at the age of *thirty years*, which was the age required by the law, to officiate as a priest, he commenced his labours, and addressed the Jews in their national capacity; this was necessary,—as a Priest, he was appointed to instruct the people,—he came to fulfil the prophecies; and these prophecies having fulfilment in the salvation he came to provide for a lost world, and the *unbelief* of these Jews according to these prophesies, being a means by which God would effect his purpose of mercy to the world, Christ spoke in *parables*, agreeably to the declaration of the prophet Isaiah, 6th chap. 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th verses, "And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and convert, and be healed. Then said I, Lord, how long? And he answered, Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate, and the Lord have removed men far away, and *there be* a great forsaking in the midst of the land." Christ declared to his disciples, see Luke viii. 10. "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God; but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand." The necessity for this, is likewise explained by Paul, in his first Epistle to the Cor. 11th chap. 7th and 8th verses. "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, *even* the hidden *wisdom*, which God ordained before the world unto our glory. Which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known *it*, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory."

Although the *parables* of Christ generally, are grossly misunderstood and perverted by unbelievers in the salvation of God for a fallen world, the *first* parable in this 16th chap. of Luke, is not only misunderstood, but it has proved a complete *stumbling block* to the most celebrated divines and commentators, which we believe will not be denied by any candid person of any sect whatever, who will take the trouble to examine their *obscure* and *contradictory expositions!* The distinguished Dr. Scott, in his Bible, when he arrived to this chapter, *fell prostrate*. His great acquirements and talents availed him nothing,—he was completely *fettered* with his unbelief and prejudices, and like a tiger in a net, he strove, rather to *get clear* of the *difficulties* which surrounded him, than to *overcome them*. And, wonderful to relate, the celebrated Dr. Clarke, in his attempt at exposition, *left out* the principal *character* in the description. It is not improbable, but some of our readers on perusing our remarks, may impute to us an unjustifiable *vanity*, or *presumption*, for undertaking that, to accomplish which, has exceeded the powers of so many others. To this we answer,—it was *the prejudices* of those who *failed*, that *caused* their *failure*; and we acknowledge finally, that if *our prejudices* against the *truth*, bore any *proportion* in point of *magnitude*, to *their talents*, we should *fail likewise!*

The Scriptures, inform us, that "The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy." And Christ declared, "That in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word may be established." We, therefore, consider the *parables* of our Lord, as his *testimony*, and their accomplishment, the fulfilment of the prophecies. The *parables* are *witnesses*,—this 16th chap. of Luke contains *two* witnesses, who testify to *two* facts, the *first* relates to the *casting off* and dispersion of the *Jews*, and the *second*, to the *receiving* of the *Gentiles*.

And Christ said also unto his disciples, "*There was a certain rich man which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods.*" The *rich man* is figurative of *God*, who is the giver of every good and perfect gift. He is the owner and proprietor of all things. "For of him, and through him, and to him are all things; and all things were made by him, and for him." The *steward*, is figurative of the *Jewish* nation. For unto them, says Paul, "were committed the oracles of God." And Paul, in his 1st Epistle to the Cor. 4th chap. 1st and 2d verses, says, "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and *steward* of the mysteries of God. Moreover, it is required in *stewards*, that a man be found faithful." The Jews were not found faithful,—accusations had been preferred against them by the prophets. "Wot ye not what the Scriptures saith of Elias? How he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars, and I am left alone, and they seek my life." The Jews were unfaithful, and *wasted* the goods which were committed to their care. The *goods* alluded to, in the parable, are the law and its ceremonial worship, which in, and of itself, was insufficient, as it could not save, or give life; but "was added because of transgression, until the seed, Christ, should come," and was typical of him. It is, therefore, manifest, that the figure of *wasting the goods*, in the parable, has a distinct and pointed reference to the *Jewish* nation; who, by their non-compliance with, and mal-appropriation of the *law*, and its *ceremonies, wasted*, and misconstrued its types to have their fulfilment in their own persons, instead of the promised Messiah. Paul unquestionably regarded it in this light, in his reproof, namely,—"Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God; for the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written." And, again, "For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God; for Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth." In this manner, the *steward wasted* the *goods*, which the certain *rich man* had confided to his care.

"*And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee? Give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward.*" John the Baptist, the herald and precursor of Christ, may be considered as calling them to give an account of their stewardship. But Christ emphatically called upon them, in this parable, but in a figurative language which they misunderstood; but which, in prophetic voice, declared their dispersion and disgrace. It has been truly and properly said, that, "what is true in natural things, is true in spiritual." The figure, consequently, introduced by Christ, and which has been proved by the passing events of nearly 1800 years, to have been prophecy, is taken from the common and frequent occurrences in human life. The steward, after being informed by his employer that he is dissatisfied with his conduct as steward of his property, &c., and called upon to give account of the same, considers very naturally, what he shall do for the future; and not expecting employment and succour from his *old* master, his *sole aim* is, to *court* the *favour* and *gain* the *smiles* and *approbation* of a *new!* This, which is so strong a feature in the character of man, was selected by the Saviour as a figure, whereby he might describe the then present and future condition of the Jews. His motive was to instruct his disciples; and wishing, for purposes already explained, to *confine* this instruction to *them*, he accordingly spoke to them in *parables!*

"*Then the steward said within himself, What shall I do? For my lord taketh away from me the stewardship: I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. I am resolved what to do; that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses.*" The steward immediately makes his calculations; and although his *own interest* is at bottom, still to secure it, he first studies the interest of others. The "Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans;" they, during their stewardship, regarded none but themselves; even their lord was defrauded, and *their own* interest claimed and received their exclusive attention. A new interest, however, seems to be created by circumstances, and the *heathen*, whom they once despised as *dogs* and *servants*, they now *court* as *companions*, and *obey* as *masters*. Wonderful metamorphosis! Here are exhibited the strongest features of human character; and even the secret purposes of the soul, stripped of every circumstance which can qualify, mislead, or deceive, is exposed to the view of the *universe!*

The steward, who for a long term of time had defrauded his lord by wasting his goods, hesitates no longer, than is necessary to mature his plans and find opportunity to put them in practice. The Jews, who had so frequently degraded themselves, and dishonoured their Lord and Maker, by their abominable idolatries, are no sooner called to an account for their conduct, than they evade an investigation; increase their blindness; and are judicially sentenced, and deprived of their stewardship. The giving an account of the stewardship,—the dismissal from that office,—and the settlement of the accounts, belonging to the office of the stewardship, with the debtors, &c., may be considered nearly simultaneous, as regards the time, although of striking difference and variety, as respects the character. When a steward is deprived of his office, he can no longer act in the capacity of a steward. The command to give an account of his stewardship, is a legal and emphatic notice that the office and its duties are no longer confided to his care; and he is neither authorized, nor justified, by the command, to prolong his continuance in the office by a settlement of its concerns. The figure in the parable is peculiar, and striking. The steward was not blamed for not settling with the debtors of his lord,—he was pronounced culpable for wasting his goods. And his motive for effecting the settlement, was not to make amends to his lord for his past misconduct, but to court the favour of the debtors, and by another crime, to gain their smiles and protection. This part of the parable is represented as spoken by the *steward* himself in *soliloquy*. It was when he was actually deprived of his stewardship that he put his plan in execution; and this view does not militate against the arrangement in the parable; for being prophecy, it is considered as one great whole, and the *future* spoken of with certainty, as though it were past. Indeed, a seeming incongruity, *apparent*, but not *real*, is necessary to constitute a parable; for if the measure of compari-

son is regular and plain, it would cease to be a parable, and would approximate to narrative, or history. All mankind are designated in the Scriptures, as *Jews* and *Gentiles*, which are convertible terms with *Israelites*, and the *Nations*, or *Heathen*. The Jews, or Israelites, therefore, being designated in the parable, under the *figure* of the steward, and God the Creator, under the *figure* of the certain *rich man*, the *Gentiles* are of necessity prefigured by the *debtors* of the *steward's lord*. The language of the steward, when speaking in soliloquy, is perfectly characteristic, and its literal correctness proved by the events of nearly eighteen centuries. It is *mammon*, which the unjust steward served; and may be justly defined to be an inordinate desire for the *goods* of the present world. The steward could not dig; Why? The prophetic mandate of Jehovah, nearly 2000 years before this, had gone forth by the prophet Moses, and declared, that if *they*, (alluding to this their dispersion,) "*built, another should inhabit;* if they *sowed, another* should *reap*." It was not indolence which produced this, the declaration of the *unjust* steward! No! It was prophecy,—and he is represented as unwittingly pronouncing his own fate!

"*So he called every one of his lord's debtors, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write fourscore.*" God reproved the Jews for their pharisaism and hypocrisy, and described them as saying in the language of their hearts, "Stand by, for I am holier than thou!" This was the characteristic of the Jewish nation. They considered all but themselves as unholy, and regarded the Gentile nations as *dogs*, and unworthy to approach their city or temple. The destruction of their city and temple, was the end of their *stewardship*. And the steward's "calling *every one* of his lord's debtors," is emphatically illustrative of their dispersion among all the nations of the earth. The *oil* mentioned in the parable, is figurative of *knowledge;* the *wheat*, of the abundant provision which God, (the *rich man*) has made for satisfying the wants of every living creature. And the *disparity* in the *accounts*, or *bills*, which was made by the *steward*, is a terrible reproof to the Jews, who would screen themselves, and excuse their own abuse of their pre-eminent advantages and privileges, by *lessening*, even in the opinion of others, their criminality, by denying their means of knowledge, and consequently, avoid the odium due to their ingratitude. There is, however, another view of this subject; and it is the principal feature in the parable. The Jews in their dispersed state would not be *received* in the *houses* of the *debtors*, or in other words, the Gentiles would not permit them to dwell among them, did they arrogantly pretend to pre-eminence in exclusive holiness, and denounce them, as they had been in the habit of doing, as dogs. The figure in the parable, in which the steward is represented as lessening the obligation on the part of his lord's debtors, is fulfilled in the *lax interpretation* of the *law* and its *ceremonies* by the Jews, since their dispersion. And the ignorance of the Gentiles of God their Creator, and their sense of obligation to him, is lessened, rather than increased, by the management of the steward, or Jews; although their dispersion is eventually to be a means in the hand of God, of enlightening and instructing them.

(To be continued.)

Saving Faith, or Modern Orthodoxy.

It is a question of great importance, whether the mind of man can at the same time embrace truth and error; or whether error must not first be eradicated, before truth can be seen, and received as truth. For ourselves, we are perfectly convinced of the absolute impossibility of the mind receiving truth, until it rejects the reverse of truth, which must be error, or falsehood. Impressed with the magnitude of this fact, we feel it to be a duty, by every effort in our power, to strip *error* of the covering, which for so long a time the superstition and ignorance of man has enclosed it. Let the *monster* only be seen, let the deformity be exposed to view, and the superstitious will lose their superstition, and the ignorant their folly. God is truth, and the kingdom of Christ is built upon truth; but the empire of Antichrist is founded upon error and falsehood. There is not,—there cannot be an alternative. A thing must be *true*, or *false*. There is no middle way. There is no neutrality. Every man is either for Christ, or against Christ. The fiat of Omnipotence has settled this question *for ever*. "He that is not for me is against me. Ye cannot serve two Masters. "To the law, and the testimony." What says the law? "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." What says the testimony? "Christ came, not to judge the world, but to save the world." Christ has "made peace through the blood of *his cross*, by himself to reconcile all things unto himself." What says Antichrist? Men make their own peace, by their own works; and reconcile themselves by their own faith. The testimony says, of Christ, that it was "his meat and drink to do the will of his Father, and his will is, that all mankind shall be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. And Christ did the will of his Father, and saved all men; and will in the fulness of time bring all men to the knowledge of that salvation, which is the truth. The *faith* of Christ was *manifested* in the prophecy, "When I am lifted up, I will draw all men unto me;" and when he was lifted up on the cross, he drew all unto him; and reconciled them unto God, *in his body* on the tree. If a man *has* this *faith*, he has the faith *of* Christ; if a man has any other faith than this, he has the faith of *Antichrist*, or the *devil*. We believe that no man in his senses will say, that a man *can* have *faith* of any kind *in God*, except he believes there is a God. We will now *admit* the truth of the commonly received opinion, that a man is justified by his own faith; and by a close calculation obtain a statement of the *number* of religious *men* who *had faith* in God, and *believed* there *was* a God, from the creation to the present time; and contrast them, in point of numerical importance and value, with those who have lived in heathenish ignorance and idolatry, worshipping stocks and stones, and sacrificing their children to devils. And in consideration of the extra time those lived before the flood, compared with the life of man since that time, and to make a sufficient allowance of time for peopling the world at the creation, and after the flood, we will allow *fifty years* to a *generation* until Christ, which is *twenty years* more, than is allowed since the Christian era; and consequently, calculate *only eighty generations* of men, for the 4000 years preceding our Saviour. During all this time, the *Jews* were the only nation who had *any knowledge* of the *true* God, with a small exception of *single* individuals, too inconsiderable to mention; and we find, even the Jews themselves, the principal part of the time worshipping the idols of the Gentile nations. The proportion of *Jews* to the *heathens*, who included all the rest of mankind, were as one to two hundred and forty,—and the Jews, who worshipped the true God, to those who worshipped idols, as one to four, the *whole* number of *mankind* who lived *previous* to the Christian *era*, amounts to sixty-four thousand millions of men, allowing eight hundred millions to a generation, and fifty years to a generation, consequently, there could not be more than *one* man to every sixteen hundred who lived *previous* to Christ, who had what is called a *saving faith;* or who in any manner worshipped the true God; or *knew* there *was* a *God*. Since Christ, 1800 *years* have rolled away, and *forty-eight thousand millions* of the human race have passed through time into an endless eternity. The proportion of these, who have heard of a God and Saviour, does not probably amount to more than one to five, of all these; and even the proportion of those who had *heard*, that had what is called a *saving faith*, cannot be reasonably estimated at more than one to five, which would amount to nineteen hundred and twenty millions, and one to sixteen hundred, previous to the *Christian era*, make, in all, nineteen hundred and sixty millions, who, allowing every favourable circumstance, are all that have experienced saving faith, from the *creation* to the *present* day; while *those* who have *died* in their *sins*, ignorant of God, and of Christ, destitute of *saving faith*, amount to *one hundred, ten thousand*, and *forty millions of men*, for whom Christ died! And according to this estimate, if *none* are *saved* at the day of judgment, but those who in *this life* had *saving faith*, if the day of judgment should take place to-morrow, instead of Jesus Christ the "Saviour seeing of the travail of his soul, and being satisfied, by having the heathen his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth his possession,"—his *little* band of *saints* and followers, would *not* be sufficient in point of numbers, to stand as sentinels round the almost *innumerable* multitude and host, which would crowd the dominions and fill the ranks of the devil, the enemy of God and man. Then, instead of the triumphant song, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, (or hell) where is thy victory?" it would be an almost *Universal damnation* and triumph of sin, death, and hell, over righteousness, salvation, and heaven. Where now, ye boasted advocates of your *saving faith*, where is your triumph? You have crowded the portals of hell—made heaven a desert, and filled the universe with anarchy, ruin and despair! This would be the effect of leaving man to save himself. Light and darkness are not more opposed to each other, than this doctrine of Antichrist, and the gospel of our Saviour. The gospel of Christ teaches, that "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now *justified* by *his blood*, we shall be saved from wrath through him. *For* if when *we* were *enemies, we were* reconciled *to God*, by the *death* of *his Son;* much more, *being* reconciled, we shall be *saved by his life*." No, says Antichrist. We are not saved till we believe; nor justified, until we *work* a work *in ourselves*, which shall make us acceptable to God. Christ sent his apostles, who testified, that we are saved by the offering of Christ, and *justified* by *his* blood. No, says Antichrist,—believe it not,—God is not so merciful as you pretend,—you must save yourself,—take my advice,—do not trust to the righteousness of Christ, or his blood alone,—if you do, hell will be your portion; for a "God all mercy, is a God unjust." How often is this declaration made, and mercy and justice declared at variance? Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, "I am God, and besides me there is none else. A just God, and Saviour." Is there another God beside this? No. But there is a demon, even Antichrist, the son of Perdition, who exalteth himself above all that is called God, and sitteth in the temple of God, (or heart of man, and tells with canting hypocrisy the tale of his own goodness,—boasts of his gracious affections,—talks of his bleeding heart, his unspeakable anxiety for the poor sinner. "I would save you if I could, but youare going into the presence of an angry God, who will damn you without mercy, and torment you for ever. O that I could save!" If there were no other evidence of the mercy of God, but his bearing with this abominable and impious blasphemy, this alone ought to be considered perfectly irresistible. How many at this day, are preaching what they call justification by faith alone; who talk long and loud of saving faith, of gracious affections? It is true, that some are willing to condescend and acknowledge, that it is the *faith of* Christ, and the *faith of* the creature *together;* but contend, that without the faith of the *creature*, and the gracious affections of the *creature*, all is lost. God, say they, has made conditions, and God *cannot* depart from them! Deny his sovereignty with one breath, and contend for it with the next! How different is the language of the Psalmist? "The Lord is my light, and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid? What could the prophet mean by this declaration? Surely, not that his own faith and works was his salvation. If that was his meaning, he has been very unfortunate in expressing himself. Paul declares, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and *that* not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." What could Paul mean? Shall we understand him as he says? Do you think Paul knew the meaning of the words he used, or do the good people of this day mistake him? There is a misunderstanding somewhere,—for ourselves, we are willing to understand Paul, as he says; especially, when it is considered, that his declaration is supported by the

general tenor of all his Epistles; and notwithstanding he lays the axe to the root of every pretension, and denies us the privilege of keeping, even the shadow of saving faith, and justifying works, but pronounces us utterly destitute of every thing good, and worse than all this, sinners from head to foot, still we would rejoice in, and accept the salvation of God, and on the *condition* too, of acknowledging, that *if* there were *conditions*, we are too *blind*, and *poor*, and *foolish*, to *comply with them*.

Now, to God, our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, be ascribed *all* the *power*, and *wisdom*, and *goodness*, and glory, FOR EVER!

THE REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Under this head, we shall occasionally notice a work, which was published in this city during the year 1817, in 12 Numbers, monthly, and entitled "THE EVANGELICAL GUARDIAN AND REVIEW," By an association of Clergymen. Namely—

"Rev. Dr. Philip Milledoler,
Rev. Dr. John B. Romeyn,
Rev. Dr. Alexander M'Leod,
Rev. Dr. Stephen N. Rowan,
Rev. James M. Matthews,
Rev. John X. Clarke,
Rev. R. B. E. M'Leod,
Rev. A. M'Clelland."

In noticing this publication, we shall confine ourselves principally to the *sentiments* inculcated, and the *doctrines* taught by the Rev Authors; and confidently hope, that the *spirit* which induced them to *publish* their views to the world, will still have influence sufficient, to induce them to *come* forward and *defend* what *they* have *published*.

It may be proper to inform the reader, that these Rev. Gentlemen are distinguished Calvinistic preachers in this city, and have to this day opposed with spirited zeal, that MUSHROOM HERMAPHRODITE, called *Hopkinsianism*. They are, in fine, at least in the *sphere* in which *they move*, a kind of *theological phalanx*, and have, like the *martial phalanx* of the Macedonian, *owed* their *success* to the *ignorance* of their *antagonists*, instead of the *sharpness* of their *weapons*.

This production, the *child of so many fathers*, is ushered into the world in a style of *lamentation*, in consequence of "*two* prominent mistakes;" the *first* is, the "exclusively regarding passing events as political," &c. The *second* is, "that the multitude attend only to the influence or effects which passing scenes have on political society," &c. And that "while they (the multitude,) are regarding the events which occur in the world, that *little* company,—the Church,—the *body* of Christ, is forgotten." We hope our Rev. Authors will pardon our vanity, when we say, that we have for some time been very *indifferent* as respects the "influence which passing events have on *political* society;" and very *attentive* to "that *little* company,—the Church;" and that they have not been, at least by us, *forgotten*. According to this, their criterion, we do not belong to the multitude; and we cannot but hope, that they will pardon our presumption in differing from them in opinion, relative to the *size* of the "*little* company,—the church;" which, if it is confined exclusively to the *disciples* of *Calvin*, is, we think, as *large* as it ought to be; and will, in future, *increase* in an *inverse* ratio. But if, by "the *little* company,—the church,"—is meant, as expressed, "the *body* of Christ," we beg leave to differ with them in sentiment, and "take sides" with the apostle, who declared of "*the body of Christ*, or the *church*," that Christ is "the *head* over *all* to the *church*, which is *his body*, the *fulness* of him that *filleth ALL in ALL*." Ephesians, 1st chap. 22d, 23d. Now we have that charity for our Rev. Authors, to say, that we believe they were as *ignorant* of the declaration of the apostle, as that multitude, who spend their time in political investigations. And "it is to be feared, (that they) forget that *they* have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto *they* ought to take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place" The apostle, speaking of the "body of Christ," says, that it is "the fulness of him that filleth *all* in *all*." This is certainly very different from the expression, "the *little* company,—the church,—the body of Christ." We are willing to acknowledge, that the phraseology "*little* company,"—agrees perfectly with *John Calvin's gospel*; and our Rev. Authors are certainly very consistent as Calvinists; but, very inconsistent as Christians. We, therefore, earnestly entreat our Rev. Authors, to read with understanding and with minds void of prejudice, the first chap. of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, and especially, to notice with marked attention the 8th, 9th, 11th and 12th verses, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be *accursed*. As we said before, so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let *him be accursed*. But I certify you, brethren, that *the gospel* which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither *received it of man*, neither was *I taught it*, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Now we appeal to the consciences of our Rev. Authors, whether they did not *receive* their *gospel*, which they *preach*, from *man* and from a *man* named JOHN CALVIN? If they did, "*Let them be ACCURSED!*" This is, to you, Rev. Gentlemen, a *solemn appeal*.—If you consider yourselves, from your relative conditions in life, whether from your reputations for *learning*, *piety*, or the high *estimation*, and almost unbounded *confidence* reposed in you by your congregations, as placed on "high above the people," and secure in your errors, invulnerable to truth, and inaccessible on all sides,—strong as you may think your fortress, there is a power above you; and you *shall* give *account* of *yourselves* to *God*, and be *ashamed!* The *ignorance* and *prejudices* of your hearers, may for a *time* form a rampart around you, inaccessible to human efforts; but that *time* will be *short!* The abominably impious hypothesis, which was generated in the *inventive* head, and nurtured in the *murderous* heart of your *guilty* prototype, John Calvin,—which has been forced into maturity in the *hot-bed* of supersition, *heated* with spiritual *pride*, and watered with the *blood* of the *martyr SERVETUS*, will end in the *disgrace* of its *advocates*,—and the last *glimmer* which shall be emitted from its expiring embers, shall be the prelude to a day of Jubilee,—the signal of the final overthrow and destruction of *Antichrist*,—the harbinger of happiness,—the lamentation of *devils*,—and the joy and triumph of the redeemed world!

Our Rev. Authors, in their 2d page, say, "With this view, the attention of our readers is solicited to the *relation* which subsists between the *church* and the *world*. The right understanding of this *relation* alone can enable us to form a just conclusion, at all times, of the events which we witness. The church is composed of those, throughout the world, that *profess* the true religion, together with *their children*. They constitute the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God; *out of which*, there is no ordinary *possibility* of salvation. The *rest* of mankind are the *world*; without God, and without hope, dead in trespasses and sins. Between these *two* classes of persons, which divide the whole human family, there is a *wide*,—a *vast difference*."

"To the law and the testimony, (Rev. Gentlemen,) if you speak not according to the things written in the book, it is *because* there is *no light in you!*" Romans iii. 9, 10, 11, 12. "What then? Are *we better than they?* No,—in nowise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is *none* righteous, *no*,—*not* ONE! There is *none* that understandeth, there is *none* that seeketh after God. They are *all* gone *out* of the *way*, they are together become unprofitable; there is *none that doeth good*,—No, not ONE!" We again appeal to you, Rev. Gentlemen, Does your gospel agree with this? Where is the "*vast difference*" you speak of? Paul, the servant of Christ, asks, Are *we* better than *they?* And answers, "No, in nowise!" How dare you promulgate such impious *falsehoods?* Where is your authority for declaring of those, whom you denominate the *world*, that to them "there is no *ordinary possibility* of salvation?" You speak contrary to "the things written in the book," and "it is because there is *no light* in you." The Scriptures testify that Christ "is the propitiation for the sins of the WHOLE WORLD,"—and you deny it! You declare, that the "church is a LITTLE company." The Scriptures declare, that they are a "great multitude, whom no man can number. That Christ shall have the heathen (not a part of the heathen) his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth (not a *little company*) his possession." If there is "no *ordinary possibility* of the salvation of the *world*," Why do you preach to the world? Do you possess *extraordinary* powers? Can you save those, whom, according to your doctrine Christ, *did not*, or *could not* save? There is one *relation* in which you stand to the *world*, which you have not *mentioned*; and it is an important one,—you are indebted to that very *world*, which you with so much complacency consign to *everlasting burnings*, for the *bread* you *eat*, and the *clothes* you *wear*,—and instead, as you, in your 3d page, have declared, "on their account, (the *little* company,) the *world* is preserved from *ruin*," you are *indebted* to this *world* you berate in such a *contemptuous* manner, for *your salaries*, and *houses* of worship,—nay more,—for all your *consequence*, and the very *opportunity*, which you with so much *greediness* seize upon, to *degrade* and *calumniate* them!!! If you are indeed, and in truth, the disciples of Christ, remember, that you his disciples, are *clothed*, and *fed*, and *nourished*, by the *world*,—and your Bibles will tell you, if you consult them, that Christ considers any act of kindness done to them as done to himself,—and the question, "When saw we thee an *hungered*, and *fed* thee,—and *naked*, and *clothed* thee,—or *thirsty*, and gave thee *drink*?"—was answered by him, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

(To be continued.)

BRIEF REVIEW of a book, entitled "the Doctrine of UNIVERSAL RESTORATION examined and refuted; and the objections to that of ENDLESS PUNISHMENT considered and answered. Being a REPLY to the most important particulars contained in the writings of MESSRS. WINCHESTER, VIDLER, &c. by D. ISAAC, Minister of the Gospel." New-York, 12mo. pp. 160. Published by Humphrey Humphreys. A. Paul, Printer. 1819."

The Reader is informed, that this is an old English publication which was a short time ago *caught* as it was *tumbling* into *oblivion*, and reprinted in this city, at the instigation, and on concern of a few *haters* of the *truth*, who gave this *old book* a *new* dress for want of something *better*, and with, as they at the time declared, the *brave* hope of *publishing down*, what they were pleased to call Universalism. Now, it is our firm conviction, that if this "little company of reformers" had *written*, or *published* a book in *favour* of the *doctrine*, in the *wretched* style of this *book*, they would have stood a *better* chance of *effecting* their *purpose*. We say *wretched style*; and wretched indeed must be that composition, which has neither *truth* nor *common sense* to recommend it. No person acquainted with the Scriptures, and believing in the salvation of Jesus Christ for a fallen world, can read the title-page of this book, without being shocked at its abominable and blasphemous impiety. "The doctrine of Universal *restoration* examined and refuted." Compare this with the declaration of the apostle, recorded in the Acts, who speaking of Christ, said, "Whom the heaven must receive until the time of *restitution* of ALL THINGS which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." What is the meaning of the word *Universal?* Does it mean *all* things, or *all* men? Surely it cannot mean more than this; and less, would not be Universal! What is the meaning of the word *restoration?* Is it not to *restore* and make *good* that which is *evil*, and which was *good* before it was evil? Where, then, is the difference between *restoring* a thing, and making *restitution* of that *thing?* These words, in the sense in which they are here used, are perfectly synonymous. If any person is disposed to play upon words, and wrest by sophistry their meaning, they must be ignorant indeed, not to know, that their misconstructions cannot effect the

original, or destroy the plain import of the term. The declared intention of the writer of this book, and his coadjutors, was, to *refute* the declaration of Jehovah and all his holy prophets. In other words, to *charge* God with *falsehood*, and all his holy prophets with *promulgating* a *lie*. This was certainly a bold attempt, and betrays both *ignorance* and *depravity*.

We give the following extracts, as samples of the writer's *attempt* at reasoning. Page 15, "It must be observed too, that the laws of God have *infinite* authority stamped upon them, and that God has laid us under *infinite obligations* to obey them. When we put all these things together, when we consider that sin may *perhaps* be infinite in its effects, that it is committed against an Infinite Being, and that it is a violation of infinite obligations, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to prove, that sin is not an infinite evil; and if it be an infinite evil, it must merit an infinite punishment." The reader is requested to notice, that this *writer* declares *positively*, that "the *laws* of God have *infinite* authority, &c.; and that God has laid us under *infinite* obligations to obey them." Now, when it is considered that it is the plain dictate of the Scriptures, of reason, and of common sense, that God *requires* of man *only* as much as man *can* perform, that if *man* is really as this *writer* says, *under* an *infinite* obligation, *one* of *two* things must result as an inevitable consequence,—either man has *infinite power*, or man *cannot* perform what God has required of him! If man is infinite in power, Who can punish him? If man is not infinite in power, and the requirement is infinite, it cannot have any relation to him. To say that man is infinite in wisdom, or goodness, would, we think, be equally absurd. Now this writer says, "the laws of God have infinite authority." What does the law of God require? Ans. Perfect obedience. Consequently, if the authority of the law is infinite, an infinite effect must result, and that effect must be perfect obedience; to say, that the law of God required perfect disobedience, would outrage every rational principle. Can man be "laid under an infinite obligation, except there is an infinite benefit conferred? No! Is endless misery an infinite benefit? If not—What is the infinite obligation laid on the sinner? This writer has left us altogether in the dark here; and we must suppose, that he considered *endless torments* an infinite benefit, as he mentions no other for the sinner, and declares, that this shall be conferred upon him. This "*dauber* in untempered mortar" says, "Sin may *perhaps* be infinite in its effects;" and immediately adds, "and if it be an infinite evil, it must merit infinite, or endless punishment." Consequently, "perhaps" it is not the case—and "if" it be not an infinite evil, it must not merit an infinite or endless punishment. Suppose this wonderful refuter had first proved sin to be an infinite evil.—Would not his conclusions have looked a little more reasonable? We think they would. With the exception of the word "*perhaps*," (and it is possible he mistook that for proof,) we see no evidence whatever. Now, "*perhaps*" ALL have sinned and come short of the glory of God—and if "it will be difficult, if not impossible to prove, that sin is not an infinite evil, and it must merit infinite or eternal punishment,"—"*perhaps*" it would be difficult, if not impossible to prove," that any will be saved!!! Now comes proof to the point, that "*endless punishment*" is an excellent thing.

In page 48. "And now the question assumes a *new* form, (the *old* one, we think, did not answer at all.) Whether it would have been *better*, to suffer a *part* of the human race to bring upon themselves destruction, when Divine Providence would make their *fall* the *means* of the *stability* and *happiness* of the rest; or, not to *give existence* to the *human race* at all." This *writer*, in support of his "new form," quotes "King's origin of evil," as follows, "If the permitting those *few* (this looks a little charitable—"*those few*") to smart under the effects of their ill choice were the very *means* and motive by which the *rest* were induced to make a good one, and "*perhaps*" all would be seduced, (Did not Paul say, ("*perhaps*") all have sinned?) if not fixed in a right choice by the *terror* of such examples, (Does not the Scriptures say, ("*perhaps*") "The goodness of God leadeth to repentance") it would still be agreeable to goodness to suffer them to make the *choice*, and feel the effects of it." Quere. "Perhaps" a *good* father would find it very agreeable to let *one* of his *children* run into the *fire* and be burned to death,—for, "perhaps" *all* would be *burned*, if they were not fixed by the *terror* of such an example." Again,—"Perhaps" Mr. Isaac did not know, that he was *aiding* the *cause* of his *opponent*, Mr. Winchester, instead of *refuting* it, by his "new form," for Mr. Winchester believed, that the sufferings of the sinner was a *means* of salvation, and Mr. Isaac, if we can *believe* him, *believed* the same thing.—This writer, in his 48, 49, and 50th pages, says, "he feels no hesitation in saying, that infants shall go to a place of happiness." He likewise says, "we do not know that the greater part of mankind are eternally miserable,—'*perhaps*' all infants may be saved." He also thinks, "that all idiots, and the chief part of those who die between the age of seven and twelve,"—(Quere. Suppose they were twelve years, and one day old? Would the extra day damn them?) will be saved, and that it will require no very great stretch of faith, and charity, (it seems however, it must be *stretched* a *little!*) to conclude, that hitherto a majority of the human race have attained to felicity in the eternal world." If Mr. Isaac had undertaken to reconcile, by analogy, reason, and Scripture, passages, which prejudice and ignorance have misconstrued and perverted, "*perhaps*" he might then have some claim to the *name* of Christian; instead of doing this, he has in his 132, 133, 134, and 135th pages, arrayed them in opposition, apparently, with the view of *crawling* away from the difficulties which surrounded him.

We dismiss this budget of impiety and contradictions, with the remark, that we neither believe, nor advocate the doctrine of Winchester, for the apostle declares of Christ, that "he *purged* our sins, and made peace by the blood of his Cross," not, that the pains of hell *purged* our *sins*, or, as Isaac teaches, that our piety makes the peace. We, therefore, recommend the reading of this book to all those, who believe the word of God in preference to human traditions, from the firm conviction, that its notorious absurdities and falsehoods, will ensure a reputation commensurate with its demerits.—And in future, let no person have the hardihood to praise this book, unless he has courage and abilities to defend it!

DR. GRIFFIN'S SERMON.

The following extract is from Dr. Griffin's Sermon, preached at the Anniversary of the United Foreign Missionary Society, in the Garden-Street Church, in New-York, as given in the *Boston Recorder* of Saturday last.

We present this unaccountable piece of superstitious folly to our readers, that they may compare it with all they have ever read of pagan superstition, and learn the immense improvement in this kind of madness which honours the orthodoxy of the present day.

EXTRACT.

"But when we contemplate those heathen as immortal, the subject swells into a magnitude beyond the ranges of imagination. Every one of them will be an angel or a devil millions of ages after the funeral of this world. Each of them will experience happiness more than all heaven have yet enjoyed, or misery more than all hell have yet endured. To think of the perdition of one pagan soul, is enough to awaken the deepest sympathy of the whole human race. But to contemplate the ruin of the hundreds of millions now on the earth, whose numbers are to be renewed once in twenty or thirty years, what heart can fail to dissolve in grief, and vehemently to cry out for help to God and man? The fashion of this world is passing away, the sign of the Son of man will appear in heaven, and you and all the heathen nations will be before his bar. Then I ask you, whether it will not appear of more importance to have converted a single pagan, than to have amassed the treasures of the Indies. I behold one of those heathen brought along in chains to receive his doom, and looking down to an eternal lake of fire! "Ah me!" says he, "And am I born to this?" He casts an eye of anguish on those who once composed the American Church, and raises his piercing lamentations: "How *could* you see me perish? Why did you not sell your estates to send the gospel to me? Ah! you never felt the pains of damnation." Indeed, my brethren; when we contemplate that scene, we know not when to stop. When we have given a few hundred dollars, we look over the immense pagan waste, and then again to the judgment, and ask, "Why should I not give as many more?" pp. 20—23.

"We have slept too long over this immensely important subject. The millions who are gone cannot be redeemed; those who are now on their way cannot be stopt; the many who must die before we can reach the fields of the missions, must die as they are, because we delayed so long. But by the bowels of Christ let no more time be lost."—p. 24.

Will Dr. Griffin ever attempt to prove, from the divine oracles, that millions and millions of the pagan world will be plunged into a lake of brimstone in the eternal world, and there suffer unmerciful torture for ever, and all this because people here in America do not give so much money to the Missionary Societies as he would be glad they would? If there be one grain of sense in the above extract, it is evident, that the infinite goodness of God, and the unbounded mercy of him, who gave himself a ransom for all men, will finally fail of saving a large portion of mankind for the want of money!

Christian people, do be so candid as to look at the preaching of the blessed Son of God, as recorded in the New Testament, and then ask, whether the divine Teacher ever intimated that his mission of mercy would finally fail for the want of money? Had Jesus and his apostles been as zealous to sponge money out of the people as our Clergy are, it would have furnished a rich topic for infidels to dwell on to the entire disparagement of their cause.

U. Magazine, Boston.

TO DISTANT SUBSCRIBERS.

We have in a very few instances heard complaints from *Subscribers* in distant towns, of not receiving their numbers regularly. We are sorry to hear of the miscarriage of any of our papers. The papers for *distant Subscribers* have in every instance been put up and delivered, either at the Post-Office, or Stage-offices, or on board of Packets, by the Editor, who will continue to deliver them. If the utmost attention on his part will ensure their regular and punctual conveyance, Subscribers may be assured they never will have cause of complaint.

P.S. Distant Subscribers, whose papers have miscarried, are requested at the expiration of the half year, to give information of any deficiencies, and it shall be our pleasure to supply them.

Note. If any of our Subscribers in distant towns wish to discontinue the "Gospel Herald" after the expiration of the six months, which the 26th Number will complete, they will please seasonably to notify the Editor, &c. Presuming that the future increase of Subscribers will be in a ratio corresponding with the past, the Editor indulges a confident hope, that the time is not far distant, when the subscription list will enable him to increase the size of the paper; which will be issued double, as often, and whenever the number of subscribers will enable him to do it.

To Correspondents.

Dean, and Theophilus, were received too late for insertion the present week. They will appear in our next Number.

Amator Veritatis, is received. It is with reluctance that we inform him, that his *refutation* of the *doctrine* of the *salvation* of *all men*, will unavoidably be postponed until the week after next, when the public shall have an opportunity of deciding on the merits of his *confutation*.

NOTICES.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first

Those persons who reside at, or in the vicinity of Norwalk, Conn. who wish to become subscribers to this paper, are informed, that Mr. Noah S. Bailey, of Norwalk, will receive subscriptions, and supply them with the Numbers from the commencement, &c.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1820. NO. 26.

An Exposition of Luke xvi.

The Parable of the unjust Steward.

(Continued.)

"*And the lord commended the unjust Steward, because he had done wisely; for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.*"

Here are three things which demand special notice. First, the *commendation*,—Second, the *reason* assigned for that *commendation*,—Third, the *wisdom*, which is mentioned in *contradistinction* to the wisdom of the *children* of *light*. A proper understanding of these, is in a great measure a key to the other parts of the parable. Christ did not say, that the unjust steward was *commended* by his lord for doing *unjustly*,—but for acting *wisely*. This is the reason assigned, and this was assigned, *because* he had *done wisely*,—and this is explained, when it is said, "for the children of *this world* are in their *generation* wiser than the children of light." The *wisdom* spoken of is confined to the *generation* of the children of this world; and the word *generation* is a convertible term for their natural lives. Thus we read in Matt. 1st chap. 1st verse, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham," &c. Christ advised his disciples to lay up for themselves treasures in heaven, where moth nor rust would not corrupt, and where thieves would not break through nor steal. This is the *wisdom* of the children of light. The Jews were not the children of light, as we have already seen; but "their eyes were darkened, that they could not see, and their ears heavy, that they could not hear." Their *treasure*, therefore, was in this world, and their *generation*, or natural life, the *end* and *object* of their *wisdom*. Paul may be considered as one of the children of *light*; and he declared, "1 Cor. xv. 19. If in this life (or *generation*) only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." The *wisdom* of the *children* of *light*, therefore, is not in their *generation*, but agreeably to their Divine Master's exhortation, it is in heaven. It is in their Father's house only, that they expect joy and peace, for "there are many mansions," and when the days of their *generation* and pilgrimage on earth is finished, they go to the place "prepared for them; for where their treasure is, there their hearts are also." This view of the subject, we think, explains, in a clear and satisfactory manner, the difference in, and distinction between the children of light, or believers in Jesus, and the children of this generation, of darkness, or the Jews. The children of this world, therefore, may properly be considered to be *wiser*, or more *attentive* and *careful* in making provision for their generation, or *in*, and during their generation, than the children of light. And the declaration of Paul, in an especial manner, is explanatory of the inconveniences and sufferings inseparable from the condition of the children of light, in the age, or generation, in which this was spoken. The children of this world, having no hope, and making no calculation of future happiness, their whole attention being engrossed by, and confined to, the things of this world, were, as regarded the concerns of their natural lives, or *generation*, *wiser* than the children of light. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, 3d chap. 12th verse, describes the children of this world, by adverting to the former state of the believers in Christ, whom he declared were once in unbelief, and "that at that time they were without Christ, (without the knowledge of Christ, &c.,) being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." This is a brief exposition of the state, or condition, of the children of this world. The Jews were, and remain to this day, emphatically without hope in the true Messiah; they looked, and still look for a *temporal*, or worldly saviour, and their wisdom is of this world. Unlike the children of light, who behold the Ensign and Banner of the cross on Calvary, and hope for a mansion in that heaven, where Christ their Head has gone before them,—they make to themselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, and strive to heap up riches, a prey to the moth, and a sacrifice to rust, in fruitless expectancy of a temporal king, whose ensign shall be lifted in the field of Mars, and whose banners shall conduct them through blood and battle to victory, and secure for them the earthly mansions of their fathers in the land of Palestine; and reinstate them in their former glory in Jerusalem, the sepulchre of their ancestors, and the city of their kings.

"*And I say unto you, Make unto yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.*" This may be considered a specific recapitulation of what, in the preceding verse, is described as a *commendation* of the *unjust steward*, and is further explanatory of that *commendation*. The reason is particularly described to be, the advantage to result to the unjust steward, by his doing wisely in his generation. It would not be taking very great liberty, or forcing the passage to an irrelevant construction, to say, that the declaration of Christ was rather *prophetic*, and consequently an exposition of what should take place, than an unqualified acquiescence in, and approbation of what should take place. Although this view of the subject is proper, still it is not absolutely necessary to adopt it, to explain the parable. It is, however, in our opinion, manifest from the tenor of the whole, that a purpose of *mercy*, and a *desire* for the *happiness* and well being of the *unjust steward*, pervades the whole. His lord, notwithstanding his culpability in wasting his goods, is solicitous for his future well being; and although the unjust steward adds to his already great and disqualifying criminality, by a fresh and increased crime, his lord pardons and approves of his motives, from the consideration of the blindness and ignorance of the infatuated criminal. Here is an example, worthy the imitation of the world. The unworthy *steward* is prevented from doing further mischief, by being deprived of his *stewardship* and power; and instead of being abandoned to misery, and made the victim of want and despair, by being pursued for ever with stern and implacable vengeance, which would in its fury *cause* the *crimes* it *punished*, his future condition is considered, and although his past conduct incapacitated him from deserving and receiving future confidence and trust, it did not extinguish in the breast of his Lord and Master affection for the criminal, or solicitude and desire for his future welfare and happiness. The words of Christ, "Make to yourselves friends of the *mammon* of *unrighteousness*," are used in a compound sense. The *steward* has been considered in the parable as an individual, and *one* person; he has been addressed in the *singular*; now the phraseology is altered, and he is spoken of in the *plural*. The *mammon* of *unrighteousness*, likewise, is first spoken of as a *thing*, or principle; it is now personified, by the declaration, "that when *ye* fail, *they* may receive *you* into *everlasting habitations*."

We now request the reader to take a retrospective view of what we have passed over, and we think our exposition relative to the *personification* spoken of will appear evident. In the first place, the steward is represented in *soliloquy*, and his determination is, to seek the favour of his lord's *debtors*; and his plan to accomplish this, was, to excuse them from the payment of a part of their debts. The *debtors* mentioned in the 5th verse, with whom he effected the compromise, and the *unrighteous mammon* in the 9th verse, have a strict *analogy*, one with the other. This will appear, by recurring to the preceding, the 8th verse, where it is said, "The lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely." What had he done? Ans.—he had *made friends of his lord's debtors*. Therefore, the declaration, "Make to yourselves *friends* of the *mammon* of *unrighteousness*," &c., was a *prophetic commendation* of what the steward would do; and is a repetition of, and explanatory of the preceding verse. There is only *truth* and *error*. Consequently, the *mammon* of *unrighteousness*, mentioned in contradistinction to the *true*, or God, necessarily includes and presupposes those, who are the friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. This parable contains and exhibits, in a striking light, the *character* of those *alluded* to; and they are of necessity Jews, and Gentiles, who included all the human race. And the unjust steward, being the figure or representative of the Jews, the debtors are the Gentiles; and the declaration, "*Make to yourselves* friends (in the future tense) of the mammon of unrighteousness," is proof, that the *steward*, or Jews, had not (in the past tense) done it; which could not be *true*, if the "*mammon* of *unrighteousness*" was *confined* to an inordinate desire for *riches*, or possessing a *covetous* disposition. Therefore, the Gentiles are here prefigured by the mammon of unrighteousness. In proof of this, and that *person* and *character* are both included in the declaration contained in the 9th verse, are the words of Christ, see Matt. chap. vi. 31, 32. "Therefore, take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after these things do the *Gentiles seek*." The *unjust steward* on being called to account, and deprived of his stewardship, immediately took these things into consideration. We likewise think this is proof that Christ did not mean his disciples, neither did he address himself to them, but in allusion to the *steward*, when he said, in the parable, "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of *unrighteousness*;" for it is manifest, that this view of the subject would make the Saviour *contradictory*, by *recommending* to them at one time, what he *disproved* at another. It is, likewise, evident, that the *benefit* the *unjust steward* expected, and was to receive, was *temporal*; and this view of the subject coincides with the *reason* assigned by Christ, for saying, "Make to yourselves friends of the *mammon* of *unrighteousness*,"—namely, "that when *ye fail*, they may receive you into *everlasting* habitations." The word here translated *everlasting*, is αιωνος, or, for ages, or, *lasting for ages*. The *habitations* which the *unjust steward*, or the *Jews*, are received into by the Gentiles, will last *for ages*, or as long as this dispensation, in which the Jews are kept in darkness and blindness, shall last; and that this is not to be endless, we have the testimony of God himself. See Isaiah vi. 9, 10, 11, 12. "And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and be converted, and be healed.—Then said I, Lord, *How long?* (Quere. How long does Calvin and Hopkins say?) And he answered, (Who answered? JEHOVAH.) *Until* the *cities* be *wasted* without *inhabitant*, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate, and the LORD have removed men far away, and *there be* a great forsaking in the midst of the land." Shall it be any longer? We answer, NO! We have here an emphatic *definition* of the word *everlasting*.—Reader, if you think it does not *last long enough*, do not blame *us* for its *shortness*; JEHOVAH has *given the definition*, and you *cannot* ALTER IT! Therefore, the time is coming when these *blind* Jews, who are now deaf to the calls of the Messiah, and who are pronounced none-lect, and are by our divine doctors judged to eternal damnation, are to be "converted and healed."

"*He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much.*" This principle is, we believe, universally acknowledged to be truth. How common is it for men to say, that dishonesty in small things, is a sufficient reason to expect it in great things? And where is the man, who would confide a large sum of money to the care and trust of another, after he had found him dishonest in a *small* sum which he had been intrusted with? This is applied in the parable to the *unjust steward*. That which was confided to his trust, was the *law* and its *ceremonies;* and this, in comparison with the *gospel*, is called *least*.

"*If, therefore, ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true.*" The phrase *unrighteous mammon*, is here used, or put in *opposition*, or *contrast* to the *gospel;* and it being the *law*, &c., which was intrusted to the *steward*, or Jews, it must be considered as *unrighteous* in a *qualified* sense; and this is easily understood, by examining the difference existing between the *law* and *gospel*,and taking the declarations of the inspired apostle as a criterion and proof. Paul, to the Romans, iv. 13, 14, 15. "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, *was* not to Abraham,or to his seed *through the law*, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law *be* heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect. Because the law worketh wrath; for where no law is, there is no transgression." And to the Hebrews, vii. 18, Paul said,—"For the law made nothing perfect." And Paul in his 2d Epistle to the Cor. iii. from the 6th to the 11th verses, contrasts the law and gospel, and explains the great difference that existed between them, and declared, "For if the ministration of condemnation (the *law*) be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness (the reverse of the mammon of unrighteousness) exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious (the law) had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth." This is plain, and to the point. The *gospel exceeds* the *law*, to that degree, that the *glory* of the *law* is not merely eclipsed, but for ever put out of sight, by the *glory* of the *gospel*.

(To be continued.)

THE REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Continued.

The Rev. Authors in their 2d page, declare, "The Church is composed of those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, (we suppose by *true religion*, Calvinism is meant) together with *their children*. They constitute the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God; *out* of *which* there is no *ordinary possibility* of SALVATION!" We have already noticed this in a brief manner; we think, however, the *error* too *gross*, and the *absurdity* too *great*, to let it pass without a just and full exposure of its falsehood and impiety. We premise, however, that we agree with these Rev. Authors, in their declaration, see 7th page, that "The followers of Christ ought not to be babes, unskilful in the word of righteousness, but advanced to *perfection*. (We would qualify this a *little*. As perfect as they please, only let it be the perfection of Christ, or, if you please, let *us advance to Christ*, for *he* is *perfection!*) They ought to be intimately acquainted with "the Scriptures, which are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Now, our word for it, if these Rev. Authors had studied the *Scriptures*,instead of "John Calvin's Institutes," they never would have made the declaration we have quoted from their 2d page. What! The Church of God composed of *those*, and those *only*, who profess the gospel of Calvin, (for it is very well known, that these gentlemen contend from their pulpits, that Calvinism alone is the "*true religion*," and all who do not believe it, are the children of the devil, and will be *tormented for ever!*) and *their children*, ALONE, of ALL *children*, are to be *saved!* This is indeed a *precious* confession. Tell us no more about your believing in the salvation of *infants*. Here is the *monster* in all his *deformity*, Look at him! VIEW HIM WELL! May our right hand forget her cunning, if we do not *put a mark upon* the *beast*, which shall *identify him*, and expose him to the detestation he so justly merits,—nay more, we will pursue him, and ferret him from his hiding place, and *scorch* him with the *fire* of *truth!* The conclusions which inevitably flow from these premises, are of a nature inexpressibly appalling and abominable. It is morally impossible that an *infant* should *believe*, or *profess* any thing; and according to *their*, or Calvin's gospel, it is "*ordinarily impossible*" for any to be *saved*, but those who belong to the "*little* company, and *their children!*" The *children*, therefore, of the "multitude," or the "*world*," cannot be saved, and are by these *would-be* judges,consigned to *endless burning!* PARENTS, we appeal to you,—to MOTHERS, who by the *sweat* of *your brows* earn the *salaries* which are lavished on these SPIRITUAL INCENDIARIES,—we appeal to your *best affections*, to that *love* for your *offspring* which the *God* of nature and *Father* of your spirits has implanted in your *bosoms*, and *entwined* around your *hearts*,—to you, whose *sensibilities*, the *plant* of *heaven*, the *fruit* of *celestial* growth, has been exercised to *agony* on witnessing the last struggle of your *babe* when life ebbed out at every pore, and your bleeding hearts, rived to the core, found sympathy alone from heaven's mercy, and drank consolation alone from the Cross of Christ,—to you we appeal,—What at such a moment would be your feelings, to hear the doom of your *suffering innocent* pronounced by these *implacable* judges, and their disembodied spirits consigned to FIRE? It would be—but language is too imperfect to portray, or even to mark the outlines of the shadow of the *execration* which would burst from your tortured souls,—it would be the last effort of a heart broken with suffering,—the last exertion of reason, leaving for ever her frantic seat,—the last breath escaping your pallid lips, in curses trumpet-tongued, hurled at the heads of your infernal destroyers! "A wounded spirit," says the wise man, "who can bear?" Where is the being, not wholly divested of natural affection, who can look even at this faint picture, and not tremble with indignation? What! Shall the religion of a *bleeding* Saviour,—shall the *mercies* of the *God of love*, be *identified* with the *hellish* machinations of the MURDERER Calvin, and the *destruction* of the *souls* of "children, the heritage of the Lord," and shall we be forbidden to lift our voice against it? God, and every honest principle forbid it! "Words are but wind"—Could we speak our feelings, it should be in *tones*, deeper than THUNDERS!—Could we *write* our *thoughts*, it should be in *letters* of FIRE!—It should be in words *burning* with a *radiance*, the mere *glimmer* of whose *kindling* should reflect from the remotest borders of creation, and annihilate with eternal oblivion this damnable heresy, the measure of whose infernal malignity no man can name! Reader, these are not the words of unadvised lips. Are you a parent?—Take your *infant* offspring just blooming into life,—mark you well the lisping prattle which, like the dew of heaven, is distilled from his lips,—view his features, unimprinted with a single discordant passion,—his countenance, the index to a heart unpoisoned with a guilty thought,—feel the soft and silken texture of his little frame,—let the best affections of your being associate with all the endearing sociabilities of your nature,—and superadded,a mothers love,—"bone of your bone,and flesh of your flesh," who draws the nectarine banquet from your bosom,—clings to your heart,—lives in your affections, and revels in your smiles,—take him,—the gift of heaven,—the purchase of the blood of the Redeemer of the world,—the heritage of God,—the fruit of your body,—the child of your love,—Take him, and with a *joyful* heart and *willing* hand, plunge him *down to hell!!!* Do you hesitate? Answer,—What restrains your hand? Is it a spirit from Hell,—or Heaven? *Calvin*, nor *devils*, mark me well, never *saved* one victim!

"It is the Divinity that stirs within you."
'Tis nature's self forbids the sacrifice,
And shows a heaven to man!!!

"Stand by, for I am holier than thou!" appears to be the language of the hearts of these Rev. Authors; and their arrogating to themselves, and the "*little* company," to which they are determined to limit the *mercy* of God, exclusive holiness, is on their part an assumption as false, as disgraceful. In their 3d page, speaking of the "*little company*," they say, "On *their* account the *world* is PRESERVED from ruin;—*they* afford *evidence* to the *world* of the truth as it is in Jesus; (it should read, as it is in Calvin)—and constitute the *central point*, to which all the events of God's providence do point. The illustration of these three particulars will explain, with sufficient clearness, the *relation* which the *church* sustains to the *world*. *First*. On account of the household of faith, the world is preserved from ruin," &c. In the 4th page, "On them, under God, the *safety* of a society or people depends, BECAUSE ON THEM THE SECURITY OF THE WORLD RESTS." In page 5. "*They constitute* the SHEET-ANCHOR *of a* NATION,—OF THE UNIVERSE!!!" Reader, What do you think of this? Should *you* feel justified in saying, that the *disciples* of *Calvin* are not the *props*, but the "*Sheet-Anchor* of the UNIVERSE?" If this is truth, what astonishing *ignorance* prevails in the *world* (not in the "little company,") relative to their *obligations* to this "little company" of Calvinists, for to them, it seems, we, the *multitude*, or *world*,are indebted for our *very present existence*,—nay, more,—they keep the *houses* from *falling on our heads;* and it is *they*, who make the *ground stable under our feet;* and to a *true believer*, who belongs to this "little company," we presume it would hardly call his faith into exercise, to *declare*, that *transplanting* the REV. DR. M'LEOD, with his *section* of the "little company," in the neighbourhood of Mount VESUVIUS, that TERRIBLE VOLCANO would be *hushed* to *silence*, and its trembling inhabitants be "*preserved* from *ruin*" by the contiguity of this wonderful "*sheet-anchor*." For ourselves, we have for a long time been sensible, that we did not know every thing; and have considered the *old saying*, "live and learn," as indicative of the probability, at least, of finding out something in future. This, however, is a *post* in the *road* to *wisdom*, to which even our *vanity* never promised that we should *arrive at*. We have, in common with the *multitude*, or *world*, it seems, been so *ignorant* as to *believe*,that "In GOD we *lived, moved*, and had our *being*, and that *in him* are all our ways." And that "All things were made by him,—and for him,—and that *by* HIM all things *consisted;*" (Quere. When Job said, "What shall I do to thee,O thou preserver of men?" Did he mean the "little company?") We have even gone so far in our belief in common with the *world*, that we have even *believed* with the prophet Nehemiah, ix. 6. that, "Thou, *even* thou, *art* Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the *earth* and all things that are *therein*, the seas, and all that *is* therein, and THOU PRESERVEST THEM ALL." And with the Psalmist, xxxvi. 6. "O LORD, *thou* PRESERVEST MAN AND BEAST!" Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, v. 17, 18, 19, 20. speaks of the OATH of JEHOVAH, who *swore* to Abraham, saying, that in thy seed, Christ, shall *all* the *families* (Quere. How would it read,—"all the families of the "little company?" &c., we think it sounds *better the old way*,) of the *earth* be blessed;" we repeat it,—Paul speaks of this OATH as "the ANCHOR of the SOUL, both SURE and STEADFAST." It would seem, however, by our Rev. Authors, that Paul did not know much. Paul was born in an unfortunate time. He came into the world prematurely,—for the *world* was not in those days, as it is now, *enlightened* by John Calvin. For ourselves, we *dare* make the *assertion*,—that John Calvin's *sheet-anchor* will not *hold on* so well as the *anchor* Paul spoke of. And if any of the "little company" take offence at this, our unqualified declaration, we tell them to their *teeth*, that they may bring their "sheet-anchor" as soon, and as often as they please, and we will undertake to beat them with the *anchor* of Christ!!!

(To be continued.)

Consistency,—Matthew xviii. 11. "For the Son of man is come to *save* that which was *lost*." 2 Cor. iv. 3. "But if our gospel be *hid*, it is *hid* to them that are *lost*." Reader, it is the *truth* alone, the gospel of the salvation of *all men* which can reconcile these passages. See Galatians iii. 8. Gen. xxii. 16, 17, 18.

CONTROVERSIAL.

COMMUNICATIONS.

In your answer, Number 23, page 95, Col. 3. you premise your belief respecting the mission of Christ, thus,—"We believe he came to save his people from their sins. Now if his people's sins are Adam's sins, we believe the Saviour was necessary to restore us from the guilt of Adam, but not without." Why do you not prove these premises? Why evade any longer? There remains with you a fenced city, and armour Paul hath furnished you with two texts, Romans chap. v. 12, 19, they show that when he wrote this Epistle he had not wholly extricated himself from the doctrine of the Pharisees.

But this doctrine of hereditary guilt, had not its origin among the Pharisees; it is more ancient, as appears by the arguments of Jeremiah and Ezekiel against it, saying, Jer. 31st chap. 29th, 30th verses, Ezek. 18th chap. 2d verse, "What mean ye that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, (forbidden fruit,) and the children's teeth are set on edge." I would willingly know what you mean by supposing that Christ's people's sins are Adam's sins? which by a concise abridgment of this prophet's arguments, will plainly appear to be without meaning. Jer. 31st chap. 30th verse. "But every man shall die for his own iniquity, every man that eateth the sour grape his teeth shall be set on edge." Ezek. 18th chap. 4th verse. "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the Son is mine; the soul that sinneth it shall die," verse 5, but if a man be just, &c. enumerating the virtues of a just man, from verse 6 to 9, ending thus, he is just; he shall surely live, saith the Lord God; then proceeding, verse 10, if he beget a son that is a robber, enumerating his vices, concludes thus; he hath done all these abominations, he shall surely die. See 14th verse. Now, lo, if he (the robber) beget a son that seeth all his father's sins, considereth and doeth not such like, describes his just doings to 17th, ending thus, he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, he shall surely live; 18, As for his father, lo, even he shall die. 19, Yet ye say, why doth not the son bare the iniquity of the father, &c. 20, The soul that sinneth it shall die; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son, &c. Is this doctrine of the prophet's consistent with the attributes of God? Doth not the reverse of this hereditary guilt make the ways of God unequal, according to the declaration of the prophet, as appears by the 25th and 29th? Is there a single text inscribed by the first penman of the Scriptures, that hath the least allusion to the doctrine of hereditary guilt? Is not the reverse apparent? The children shall not be put to death for the iniquity of the fathers. Again, reasoning from analogy,—If Adam's children are guilty of his sin, the children of the Israelites would be guilty of their sin, and subject to their fall in the wilderness; but instead of this, Moses told them, Deut. 1st chap. 29th verse, "Your little ones, which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil, they shall go in thither."

It also ought to be observed, that Christ, when describing his mission, never mentions the doctrine of original sin; but told his disciples, John xv. 22. "If he had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin." And Philosophically speaking, if God had finished his creation before Adam fell, it is utterly impossible for his descendants to receive any other being, portions nor conditions, than what would be the productions of these laws, that were established at the creation to bind the system of man, and constitute the system. And if there was ever a son or daughter, propagated from Adam by generation after his sin and fall, those very descendants of his are precisely the very same in their nature, that Adam was when first created, and finally, the very productions of those laws founded on the creation, and constituted by the all-wise unchangeable attributes of God to govern mankind, and to say that Adam's posterity are subject to a new constitution in consequence of his transgression, is destroying the power of Omnipotence, and declaring that the creature has outdone the Creator, and obliged him to devise a new constitution by appointing a Saviour, as certain, as the intention of men, if they should cut off the ears and arms of their neighbour, with an intent that children begotten of his body afterwards, should be without them, would be frustrated by the laws of God predominent in nature, constituted on the day of man's creation; so certain do the descendants of Adam inherit at their birth every quality that was in possession of their primogeniture. The reverse of this your's (hereditary guilt) is enough to make a thousand Deists, for it is impossible, no man is bound to believe that which is impossible; no man can be justly blamed by the Majesty of heaven for rejecting such a physical impossibility.

Let it be further considered that you have stated your belief thus, "He (Christ) came to save his people from their sins; now if his people's sins are Adam's sins, we believe the Saviour was necessary to restore us from the guilt of Adam, but not without." In the next column, you repeat the interrogatory, Will Adam be saved in consequence of his being pronounced good? *Ans.* Surely not. You answer "true, nor damned neither." (I reply, true also.) Now your premises stand thus,--the Saviour is necessary to restore man from the guilt of Adam; and when restored into his good state, they can neither be saved nor damned. Where are you, friend? Further, ye have said, in the same column, if man was made good and in his proper sphere, if he is altered, he must be bad, and in an improper sphere. How will you get out of this labyrnth; will you deny your hypothesis, and follow me? This is my opinion, in that good sphere in which Adam was placed, he can be neither saved, or damned, for Psalm xlix. 12, 20. "Man that is in honour and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish." In this state mankind will perish like the beast; to prevent this, the Lamb that was slain from the foundation, which is an incorruptible seed, is present to transform them by regeneration out of their first animal nature and sphere, into the Divine nature and sphere; they being changed and fitted to enjoy a new sphere. The worm in its first sphere was good, yet it is transformed and fitted to enjoy a superior one. Again you reply, The Scriptures say God made man in his own image. *Ans.* True. But how was it done? for our first parents were created of earth, which possesses nothing of Divine nature, and both Gen. v. 2. named Adam or earthy, *Ans.* By regeneration. For nothing short of God, or his nature, can beget his likeness or image. Again you reply, If Friend Dean could prove that man was made of the earth, before the earth was created, and while it was without form and void, we think there would be a little reason in his hypothesis. I cannot understand you; how it could be reasonable for man to be created of the earth, before the earth was created, and while yet void. Again, you reply "If I could prove that man was without form and void, after he was made, there would, we think, be a great deal of reason in his hypothesis, and very little in the Scriptures." I cannot understand how a man can be without form and void, after he is made, except in the Divine image. In my last communication I laboured to convey the idea as my opinion, that man was without divine form and void after he had received his animal modification, till he was regenerated by a Divine principle. But I am still further surprised to see you tell me, that there would be a great deal of reason in my hypothesis, if I had placed it in opposition to the Scriptures.

DEAN.

REMARKS.

The singular phraseology made use of by our correspondent, and the strange notion he has given birth to, has produced, we understand, from some of the *Society* of *Friends* in this city, a declaration, that our correspondent is not one of their faith, and they expressed a wish, that we should neither consider, nor report him as such. Now it is our wish to please *all*, provided we can do it consistently with truth. It is presumed, that addressing our correspondent by the appellation of Friend, has occasioned this remark and request. We took it for granted, from the phraseology of our correspondent's first communication, in particular, that he belonged to that society; and we cheerfully confess, that, with all his failings, our correspondent appears to us, at least, to be very gentle and friendly; so much so, that we cannot consider him an *enemy*, and therefore, on this principle, if no other, we presume that we shall be tolerated in the use of the term. We cannot refrain, however, from expressing great disappointment at the *strange* course friend Dean has pursued, so contrary to what he at first promised. For to be candid, we think he has *made* much more *rubbish*, than he has *cleared away*.

In his *first* paragraph, he has mistaken our *conclusions* for *premises*, and asks, "Why do you not prove these premises?" &c. The "fenced city and armour," he speaks of as remaining with us, we expect will continue to remain; maugre all the efforts of our opponents to the contrary. To be plain with friend Dean, we think it very surprising, that he should mistake us altogether. Our *conclusions*, which he is pleased to call *premises*, ought to have satisfied him, that we do neither believe nor advocate the doctrine, that the *sin* of *Adam* is the *sin* of his *posterity*. And we again reiterate our former declaration, "We believe Christ came to save his *people* from *their* sins; and *if* his *people's* sins are *Adam's* sins, we believe a Saviour was *necessary* to restore *us*, or his *people*, from the *guilt* of *Adam*, and not without." We likewise think it necessary to inform friend Dean, that declarations, of the kind he has introduced, relative to the apostle Paul's being swayed by the doctrine of the *Pharisees*, is a kind of *evidence*, which in our opinion is *good* for *nothing*; and except his declaration is supported by *proof*, it must be scouted without further ceremony.

Friend Dean's *second* paragraph looks better.—The complaint oft he Israelites which he alludes to, was unquestionably the fruit of their ignorance of the character of God, and themselves. Had they been sensible of their own unworthiness, they never would have resorted to a miserable subterfuge to clear themselves from blame, or accused their Creator of being unequal in his ways or providence, and punishing them for the sins committed by their fathers in the wilderness.

The *third* paragraph in friend Dean's communication, may, for aught we know, contain something like common sense and argument, but we frankly confess we cannot see, or find it. We the more readily pass it over, from the conviction that it must, at least, be harmless, and that conjecture is probably the only key to it. If it contains wisdom, we heartily hope our readers will find it. And if there is any wrong principle of a dangerous tendency contained in it, we cannot but hope, that it lies so deep, that by the time it shall get out, an antidote will be prepared to correct it.

Our correspondent, in his *fourth* paragraph, again mistakes our *conclusions* for *premises*. And in answer to his interrogatory, "Where are you now?" We answer seriously, that we are wondering at his *blunders*. Our correspondent must have a poor memory; he *now* says, "This is my opinion, in that *good* sphere in which Adam was *created*; he can neither be *saved* nor damned." And in his *first* communication he said, he believed, that "Adam and all his posterity were *created* under the *necessity* of a *Saviour*, to regenerate *them* out of the image of Adam, or earthly nature, into the image of God." This is strange manœuvring for one, who professes to believe in conditional salvation. The conclusion of friend Dean's communication, is, perhaps, almost without a parallel. The inconsistencies and absurdities which we pointed out in his former communication, he now boldly *charges* upon *us*. What we meant, and we think it must have been obvious to all our readers, was, that if our correspondent could prove his declarations, there would have been something like *connexion* between his *premises* and *conclusions*, without which *proof* we think they have no more *connexion* than the *antipodes*.*—

* *Note.*—How can it be possible for any doctrine, or statement, to *contradict* the Scriptures, and both be reasonable? Is falsehood reasonable? Had our correspondent *proved* his hypothesis to be *truth*, his hypothesis *contradicting* the Scriptures, would, of necessity, have *destroyed* the validity of the Scriptures, and consequently, there would have been *much* reason *in* his *hypothesis*, and *none* in the *Scriptures*.

We conclude our remarks, by observing, that it is with astonishment and regret, that we discover so much moderation in the manner and disposition of our correspondent, deprived of its natural benefit and advantages, by an unnatural combination and mixture with error and absurdity.

For the Gospel Herald.

To the Sincere Inquirer after Truth, and all Candid Readers.

Gentle Reader,—Please to excuse my delay in not answering sooner what may be deemed the abusive and ungenerous strictures of the Editor, upon my brief, yet full, and I hope satisfactory answer to the Inquirer after Truth. I have been too much occupied to attend his remarks, flowing from prejudice, and producing its fruits, viz. misapprehensions and misconstructions. I have not got Cruden's concordance, as he has, by which to find chapter and verse. I have found it *tedious* to find the texts that *prove* the truth of what *I* asserted, and the incorrectness of *his* declarations. But I have found *some* of them, and expect he will insert them, and avoid answering them abusively, through prejudice or ill will. In his Prospectus, he says, his columns are open for *all;* and he solicits correspondents, but when they come, if he cannot overturn their writings, he should not wrest their meaning, or turn it into *disgraceful levity* and *undignified buffoonery.* As his columns were open for all, I also attempted to answer the Inquirer.

Second. The Editor says, "It appears the Sincere Inquirer is up for a *market,* and Theophilus, it appears, is very eager for the *purchase.*" And then, uncharitably and untruly, insinuates, that Theophilus *baits* the Inquirer with *filthy rags* and *rubbish,* given to the Inquirer by way of payment, to induce him to join his party.

Ans. Theophilus recommended the Inquirer to *no party,* sect, or denomination, fully believing with the apostle Peter, that, "in every nation, he that feareth God, and *worketh* righteousness, is accepted of him," Acts x. For Theophilus believed, that Jesus Christ is God, the truth: for Jesus said, John xiv. 6. I am the *way,* the *truth* and the *life:* and no man cometh unto the Father but by me," who am the way, &c. John says, 'Christ is the true *light* that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world;' which light is the *word* of God, by which the heaven and earth were made, John i. 2. &c. which is also an *internal word,* nigh in the heart, and not afar off; Rom. x. Therefore, he desired the Inquirer to turn his attention to the way, *light* and *witness,* Rev. i. 15. in every man, &c.; showing them their dark and wicked hearts; which in their natural state are desperately wicked: Who can know them but by this light? This the prophet knew by the light: for it is the light that manifests all things that are reprovable. "*All things that are reproved are made manifest by the light.*" Eph. v. 13. This is the light we must become acquainted with to obtain peace. "Acquaint thyself with God and be at peace! Job xxii. 21. For it is God, the Omnipotent Father *in* man, who "will not justify the wicked," Exod. iii. 7. in his wickedness, but reproveth the unwise, and poureth out his Spirit on them that turn at his reproofs to him that smiteth them; to God, who out of Christ is a consuming fire. Therefore, to Christ the way, light, &c., the Sincere Inquirer was recommended, and not to any *party.*

Third. The Editor says, he wonders if Theophilus will acknowledge that God and the devil are in the same persons. This looks *captious.*

Ans. The devil is the father of lies, and worketh in the children of disobedience. Eph ii. 2. Disobedient to Christ the light, who is pressed under them as a cart is pressed full of sheaves. Quere. Where is Christ, when thus pressed under, while Satan rules?

Fourth. The Editor asks, Who made this declaration, that Christ within is the hope of glory? *Ans.* Paul to the Colossians that were *in* Christ (chap. i. 1 and 27, says, Christ in you (not out of you, is) the hope of glory," which is an *important truth.*

Fifth. Theophilus advised the Inquirer after Truth, (which is God) to turn his attention inwardly, to the light of God in his own conscience; but the Editor says, that Theophilus advised the Inquirer to look in *upon himself,* which word (*himself*) the Editor has in *italics,* either ignorantly, or intentionally, to subvert the sense. Theophilus advised the Inquirer to turn his attention inwardly to this light in his own conscience; because it illuminates in man's darkness, though the darkness comprehends it not. John i. 5. The Scriptures hold forth this light to be God's *word, witness; Christ* the Lord who assumed flesh, and who is the Saviour, Immanuel, or God with us. And by this power alone, bearing witness with John's spirit, John knew that he was *of God,* and that the whole world lay in wickedness; and by this power only we can come to the same experience of John and the apostles.

Sixth. Theophilus declared, agreeably to the Scripture, that Jesus Christ is the *way,* the *truth* and the *life;* and that no man can come or go unto the Father, but by the Son. John testifies to the truth of this; so that Theophilus was doing rightly when he thus directed every inquirer after truth, and all who wished to know the truth of these things, and the truth of the Scriptures, written by the inspiration of truth, to first seek, wait for, and experience the saving operation of this power, wisdom and Christ of God; and endeavour to find it *in themselves only* (though not of themselves, but *of God.*) He has sufficiently expressed this, in the fore-part of the second paragraph; for there the inquirer is advised to turn inwardly and attend to the light [which is Christ the *way* in them] that enlighteneth every man that comes into the world." John i. "The path of the just is as the shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day. Prov iv. 18. The reason Theophilus recommended the perusal of Wm. Laws address to the clergy (a small work,) life of Jane Guion, &c. (misprinted Wm. Lewis and Jane Gordon) was to confirm the propriety of his recommendations, by their agreement with the Scriptures and elucidation of the subject. Judge, candid readers, whether the recommendation of these, was advising a *different way,* which the Editor (I am sorry for him) has erroneously and ungenerously asserted. He also, without reason, or proof, accuses Theophilus of *deistical* or infidel principles! whose peace is so consonent with the expressions of the Bible. I did not recommend Governor Penn's *works,* I only mentioned a small work. I hope the Editor will excuse me for rectifying his mistakes.

Seventh. Theophilus declared, that he wished to encourage the Inquirer, to seek the Lord where he may be found, and where he manifests himself. The Editor asks, "*where is that?* Is it in the corrupt heart of the sinner?" &c.

Ans. 'If you believe that God is every where, he is also truly in your *soul,* as a *thing* that is most like to him. This being so, we ought, therefore, to seek God where he is; and he being no where so expressly, as in the centre of your soul, it is there that he must be sought, and if you ask me the method and the way to find him in the bottom of your soul; I answer, there is no other but to remove all the hinderances, by casting out of your soul all earthly affections, that you may have no other affection but for him. Your soul will no sooner be freed from all these earthly affections, than it will fall into God, as the stone falls into its centre. I know no other method but this disengagement from ourselves, and from all other things, to find God, and to become one with him. I have sometimes sought him without me, by actions which seemed good; but I have since remarked, that those served for distractions; and the more I acted outwardly, so much the more I did stray from my God. Therefore, Sir, become wise by my loss, and do not lose your time in seeking means *out* of yourself; for they serve us often for hinderances. Our soul is his *true temple* and the place of his rest. Let us only remove all that is between him and our soul, and we shall see him, face to face, to speak after our manner: that is to say, we shall see him clearly by faith, and shall know him by the operation which he will make in us, and shall taste him by the repose and consolation of our conscience. Isaiah says, 'Seek ye the Lord while he may be found; call ye upon him, while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him: and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.' And Christ says, Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come into him, and sup with him, and he with me, Rev. iii. 20.

Eighth. The Editor next interrogates; whether the Lord is to be found *in the Scriptures;* which, says he, the apostle declares "*are able* to make us wise unto salvation."

Ans. Does he believe this is true without Paul's addition to this sentence; which addition he left out? if so:—the Editor has found out another way than Christ *inwardly revealed,* to teach the saving knowledge of salvation: whereas, under the new covenant dispensation, the Comforter or Lord was to teach the people himself, John xvi. 7, 13.—1 John ii. 27.—And it is also written, 'They shall all be taught of God.' The Scriptures 'are able to make wise unto salvation; [but only] *through faith* which is *in Christ Jesus*' for so reads the text. 2d Timothy iii. 15th, and of this *faith,* Jesus is the '*author* and finisher;' agreeable to Heb. xii 2d.—The Scriptures testify of Christ, that he is the *way* to salvation, and the very *wisdom* of God. And Christ, the wisdom of God, teaches us to come to *him* for salvation and wisdom. For thus he said to such as believed that eternal life, or *salvation,* was to be found *in the Scriptures,*—'Ye search' [translated,—'*Search*'] the Scriptures:—for in them ye think ye have *eternal life,* and *they* are they which testify of *me:*—and ye will not come to me, that ye *may* have *life,*' eternal life and salvation. Now let me ask the conscience of every candid reader, where Christ, the seed of eternal life, is *sown,* found and cultivated, if not in *us,* as a light enlightening every man that cometh into the world; as the Spirit of God given every man to *profit* withal; or as the seed of the kingdom, or word of God, sown in man's heart? Mark iv. 15.—Luke viii. 2. 15. Can salvation be found *in the Scriptures;* where God has decreed that every soul, Jew, Christian, Mahometan and Pagan *may* find it in the light, *seed,* spirit, or *word,* of God, (Christ Jesus?) *No:* for this would be to make the Scriptures and not Christ the *way* of salvation. If Christ is the *way;* and no man cometh unto the Father but by him, the only *door to find the Lord;* then he is the only *way,* and the Lord is not to be found in the Scriptures.

THEOPHILUS.

(*To be continued.—Answer in our next.*)

To the Patrons of the Gospel Herald.

Fellow labourers in the 'cause of Truth. This 26th Number of the G. Herald, completes the first subscription for the term of six months. An exposition of the views of the Editor may remove objections, and inspire confidence. The design of this paper is the *refutation* of *error,* and the *establishment* of Truth. Consequently, this *paper* will never be made a *pecuniary* concern. This work was commenced with a *very small* subscription, and with the exception of a *few,* who are friendly to the cause it advocates, who have procured subscribers for the work, the paper has so far *depended* in a *measure* upon *its own merits,* and the assistance of a *discerning public,* for its support. The Editor considers this *paper* as the *property* of its *patrons,* and *himself,* as their *steward;* and with the assistance and counsel of a kind Providence, he confides in the pleasing expectation of proving, at least, in a measure, *true* to his *trust.* The motive which has induced the Editor to depend for the future increase of subscribers, *alone* upon the *liberality* of the *public,* and the *merits* of the work, proceeded from his desire of *perpetuating* the means of information, by the *preservation* of the *paper,* which, in a *promiscuous* subscription, however grateful it might be to the *pocket* of the *Editor* would, by the *destruction* of a considerable proportion of the papers, be very far from being *grateful* to his *heart?* The sum already received by subscription for this paper, has not *paid* the Editor *one cent* for his *trouble and services,* which consideration, it is presumed, will, at least, *so far* exculpate him, if *not* from *mercenary views,* at least from the charge of *being* benefited by them.

From the very favourable opinions of many of our *city* Subscribers relative to the work, and the high estimation in which it is viewed by many of our friends in *distant towns,* who have expressed themselves in terms too flattering to mention, the Editor cannot but indulge the pleasing anticipation, of very soon being enabled by the increase of Subscribers, to issue the paper in a *double form, eight pages,* and so frequently, as to clear him from the imputation of *even* attempting to '*make a friend of the unrighteous mammon,*' of even the most captious.

Note. Those of our city Subscribers, who wish to *discontinue* the *paper,* are requested to inform the *carrier* of their determination, *next week,* when he will present himself for the delivery of the 27th Number, which will commence the next half-year.

Errata.

In Number 25, page 101, column 2, 5 lines from the top, for "we acknowledge *finally,*" read, "we acknowledge *freely.*"

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1820. NO. 27.

AN EXPOSITION OF LUKE XVI.

The Parable of the unjust Steward.

(Continued.)

"*And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?*"

We have seen that the *goods* which the '*certain rich* man' intrusted to the care of the *steward*, was the "*law* of *Moses*, and its *ceremonial worship*." And the apostle Paul considered them as the *peculiar* people of God, because "unto them were *committed the oracles of God*." The *figure* in the *parable*, and the *cause* assigned by Christ for depriving them of that which *belonged* to *another*, is common in the transactions between men in the world, from which the *data* was selected to illustrate the *case* of the *unjust steward*. When a man by habitual and gross misconduct *wastes* the property of others, it is reasonable to suppose, that he would be alike unmindful of his own. And the fact, that in civilized communities, *laws* have been enacted for the *benefit* of persons of this description, who *waste* their *goods*, and they declared to be *non compos mentis*, may be adduced as perfectly illustrative of the *dealings* of the *unjust steward's lord*. This view of the subject, is not only consistent with reason, but with humanity and benevolence; and the reason assigned is therefore *just*, because it is good, and the well being of the criminal is the motive for circumscribing his powers, and lessening the evil, which would otherwise proceed from his misconduct. '*If*,' *therefore*, '*ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?*'

What is that, which is called the steward's *own*? *Ans.* It is that which is mentioned in contradistinction to the *unrighteous mammon*, to the *least*, &c., and is the *gospel of Christ*. This is emphatically the *true riches*. It is figurative of the "*bread* of *life* that came down from *heaven* and giveth *life* unto the *world*." The gospel or the salvation of God for a fallen world, is *their own*, they belonging to God, and being in common with the Gentiles, the children of our heavenly Father, and *heirs* according to the *promise*. "For I would not brethren that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part has happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob, for this is my covenant with them when I shall take away their sins. As concerning the gospel, (which is the true *mammon* or *riches*, and which is the *steward's*, or Israel's *own*) they are enemies, (the steward is deprived of his stewardship,) for your (or the Gentiles) sakes; but as touching the election, (i. e. respecting the cause of keeping them, the *steward*, in blindness, and depriving him of his stewardship, it is not because the lord hated his steward,) they are beloved for the fathers' sakes, &c. For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, (deprived them of the *stewardship*) that he might have mercy upon all. O the depth of the riches, (the *true mammon*, which is the steward's *own*. See Luke xv. 31. 'Son, thou art always with me, and ALL that I HAVE is *thine*.") both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out."

'*No servant can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.*"

To understand this, in its extensive sense, it is necessary to consider, first, that a *servant* might serve *two* persons, each of whom should exercise equal and complete dominion over him; but their *end* and *aim* being the *same*, they would in *fact*, though not in *form*, be but *one* master. Therefore, to constitute *two* masters, it must be *two* persons of different dispositions and pursuits, between whom there exists no reciprocity of *sentiment* or *interest*. This view, and we think it a just one, is explanatory of the declaration of Christ, "*Ye cannot serve God and mammon.*" The word *mammon* is derived from the *Syriac*, and signifies *riches*, or any thing of value among men. This we believe agrees well with the *original*, and being there used in a *figurative* sense, and the Pharisees who heard Christ, understanding him as reproving them *literally* for their avaricious dispositions, being "*covetous, they derided him.*" The *law*, therefore, is prefigured by the word *mammon*, and the *gospel* by the declaration, *serve God*. This is understood, if we consider, that the *Jews*, or the *unjust steward*, sought *their righteousness* by the '*works* of the *law*, and stumbled at that stumbling stone," &c., which is Christ. And the *impossibility* of serving these *two masters*, is obvious from the apostle's declaration, "You that are justified by the *law*, are fallen from *grace*." Again,—"Ye are saved by *grace*, (the righteous mammon, or God) through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." (or the true mammon.) It is morally impossible for any man to *serve* the *law*, and at the *same time* hope *alone* for *salvation*, from the *grace* or *favour* of God. If, says the apostle, "*righteousness* comes by the *law*, Christ is *dead in vain*." Again,—"If there could have been a *law*, which *could* have *given life*, verily, *righteousness* should have been by the law." Can language be plainer? No! It is impossible. "The law came by Moses, (and it was added because of transgression, until the seed, Christ, should come, to whom the promise was made,) but grace and truth (the *righteous mammon*) came by Jesus Christ." Again,—Christ declared, "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God (the *true*, or *righteous mammon*) is preached unto you." The '*Pharisees*,' says the Evangelist, 'when they heard the *parable*, or all *these things*, they *derided* him.' And the Pharisees in these days *do the same*. Our Pharisees are as *covetous* as those of *yore*, and value their *righteousness* (the unrighteous mammon) above the *gospel*, (or true mammon,) of Christ.

"*And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts; for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.*"

Reader, What is *highly esteemed* among men at the present day? We *declare*, and we appeal to all creation for the *truth* of our *declaration*, that it is *not* the *salvation of God, free and unconditional* for a *lost world*, which is *highly esteemed!* Let this be remembered.

The 15th verse is remarkable. "*The law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and* EVERY MAN *presseth* INTO *it.*" In the language of the prophet, we may with propriety say, "*Who hath believed our* (or this) *report?*" What! *every man press into the kingdom of God?*" This is UNIVERSAL SALVATION!!! Can it be true? What! *Sinners* be saved? Impossible! *Vile wretches* enter heaven? *Horrible* idea! Reader, mark well what follows—"*And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, that one tittle of the law to fail!*" Therefore, there will be *no sinners in heaven!* Fear not ye *pious souls*, you will not be *contaminated*—for when "Christ was lifted up from the earth, he drew all unto him." Then, *every man* pressed *into* the *kingdom of God*, and "Christ the head of every man," rendered *perfect obedience* unto the *law*, and *fulfilled it*; the members *in*, and *with* their *head*, fulfilling the prophecies: for agreeably to the prophet Daniel, Christ, then in himself, *with*, and *for* the *members of his body*, "FINISHED SIN, AND MADE AN END OF TRANSGRESSION." Hebrews x. 9, 10. "Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, (the law, or unrighteous mammon) that he may establish the second. (The *gospel*, or true mammon.) By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ ("for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones,") once *for all*." Therefore, at the crucifixion of Christ, "*every* man pressed into the kingdom of God." When Christ said, 'It is finished,' the *law* was *fulfilled*,—the *prophecies* were *accomplished* in the *salvation* effected for a lost world! For "*It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.*

"*Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery.*" This is the *link* in the *chain* which connects the two *parables*, and is further explanatory of the dealings of the *steward's lord*, and the reason for dismissing the *unjust steward* from his *stewardship*. The *unjust steward*, or *Jews*, committed *spiritual adultery* by forsaking the law of their God, and worshipping the *idols* of the heathen nations. And the calling the *unjust steward* to account, and *depriving* him of his *stewardship*, was predicted by the prophet Hosea, chap. iii. and iv. to the 3d verse. "*Then said the Lord unto me, Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress, according to the love of the Lord toward the children of Israel, who look to other gods, and love flagons of wine. So I bought her to me for fifteen pieces of silver, and for a homer of barley, and a half homer of barley. And I said unto her, Thou shalt abide for me many days: thou shalt not play the harlot, and thou shalt not be for another man, so will I also be for thee. For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without a teraphim. Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days.*

Hear the word of the Lord, ye children of Israel: for the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood. Therefore shall the land mourn, and every one that dwelleth therein shall languish, with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven; yea, the fishes of the sea also shall be taken away.

The woman spoken of by the prophet, is the 'unrighteous mammon,'—and beloved of her friend, is figurative of the Gentiles, who is the friend spoken of. It is proper to observe here, that the same style of commendation is made use of, as in the *parable* spoken by Christ. The Lord says, by the prophet, 'Go, yet *love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress.*' And Christ says in the parable, '*I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness,*' &c. We likewise request the reader to notice, that here is another definition given by JEHOVAH of the word, in the original αιωνιος, in the parable, which is translated *everlasting*. The 4th and 5th verses, of this 3d chap. of Hosea, proves, if language has any meaning, or can prove any thing, that it means a limited time. The 'unjust steward,' or Israelites, therefore, 'put away his,' or their 'wife,' and committed adultery. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, vii. to the 4th verse inclusive, "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So

then, if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from the law; so she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God."

The reason assigned by the apostle, why believers are dead to the law, is, that it is by the 'body of Christ,' and they can be 'married to another,' &c. The unjust steward, or Jews, could not be married to another, because they were *not* become dead to the law by the body of Christ, being blinded. The same apostle, in his Epistle to the Galatians, v. 3, 4. "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the *law*, ye are fallen from grace." Why so? How is this? *Ans.* See chap. ii. 21. "I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness *come* by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." Reader, we appeal to you,—and seriously too, would this doctrine which Paul preached, be tolerated in any two churches in the city of New-York? No! It would not. What! Shall a man be unrighteous and unconformed to the law of God, and not frustrate, or by his unrighteousness prevent the grace of God from being extended to him? Shall so vile a sinner be saved? Reader,—the apostle of Christ shall answer the question, if not, "then Christ is dead in vain!!!" To modern Pharisees, who make great pretensions to holiness, personal holiness, we say in the words of the apostle, 'Christ is become of no effect unto you; whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace!" Why? *Ans.* "Ye cannot serve God and mammon! Ye cannot serve two masters!" There never was a man who depended on Christ *alone* for salvation, who judged his neighbour to damnation! No! NEVER! And there never was a man who trusted alone to Christ for salvation, who made any pretensions to personal holiness! No! NEVER! To all those who have come out from among these Pharisees, who have by God's assistance disentangled themselves from this yoke of bondage,—to you, in the apostle's stead, we say, and we would speak it with energy too, "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not again entangled with the YOKE OF BONDAGE ... free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of ma...ousness, but as the servants of God." Be ye not like the adulterous and unjust steward, for "ye are become dead to the law by the body of Christ." Therefore, stand fast in your liberty,—if you do not, you will confess yourselves "bound to the law as long as you live," and you will be guilty of spiritual adultery, confessing with your mouths your obligation to keep a law, which no mere man ever kept, and your violation of that law will blast your hopes of heaven. Remember, that "Christ of God is made unto you righteousness," and that is sufficient for you. And wo to that man, who impiously denies this truth, and makes to himself a friend of the modern mammon of unrighteousness, personal holiness, alias, 'filthy rags!' Let the unjust steward, the outcasts of Israel, be to you a warning; you have seen in this parable the cause of his being called to give an account of his stewardship; and the effects which resulted from being deprived of his stewardship, will be shown in our exposition of the parable of the "rich man and Lazarus," which will be commenced in our next Number.

(To be continued.)

EVIDENCE *from a Trinitarian Author, proving that the 7th and 8th verses of 1st Epistle of John, 5th Chap. are, whenever found in the New Testament, an interpolation.*

The writer of the "Eclectic Review" of the "Improved Version," and of "Griesbach's Greek Testament," decidedly approves of the omission of *this text* in those works, and says, "It is found in no Greek MS. ancient or modern, except one to which we shall presently advert; in no ancient readings, being *interpolated* only in the later transcripts of the Vulgate. Not one of the Greek fathers recognizes it, though many of them collect every species and shadow of argument, down to the most allegorical and shockingly ridiculous, in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity; though they often cite the words immediately contiguous, both before and after; and though with immense labour and art they extract from the next words the very sense which this passage has, in following times, been adduced to furnish. Of the Latin fathers, *not one* has quoted it, till Eusebius of Lyons, in the middle of the fifth century; and in his works there is much reason to believe that it has been *interpolated*. Under these circumstances, we are unspeakably ashamed, that any modern divines should have contended for retaining a passage so indisputably *spurious*."

CONTROVERSIAL.

ANSWER TO THEOPHILUS.

"Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?"

Now be it known unto all men, that we refuse in the most unqualified manner to call white black, or black white; straight crooked, or crooked straight. And that our correspondents, setting aside the evil of their example, and the inconveniences which must result to them, should this touchy disposition, which they appear at times to be troubled with, become, as we have reason to fear it will, habitual, it is quite immaterial what our correspondents call us. We should, however, prefer, for their sakes, and for reasons above-mentioned, that they would keep within the bounds of moderation, and at least, 'keep probability in view.' For ourselves, we shall neither swerve to the right hand, nor to the left; truth is our object, and the smiles or frowns of our opponents are both acceptable; and we feel the same disposition towards them, when they scold, as when they praise us. We wish them all as much happiness as they can possibly be susceptible of, both here, and hereafter; and our good wishes are at the bottom, always, when we reprove them for their folly, or point out the absurdities, which we are sorry to say, too frequently for their good appears in their writings, and are cherished in and associated with their sentiments. Theophilus, to our great sorrow, appears very much discomposed in his mind; and when we consider the 'tedious' time which he, according to his account of the matter, has had in attempting to 'prove the truth of *his* own' assertions, and the incorrectness of *our's*, surprise at his ill-humour is not only lessened, but we are disposed to sympathize with him, on account of his, so great a trouble.

The third paragraph contains a declaration, which we are afraid will occasion Theophilus another tedious job, to prove it to be truth. "Theophilus recommended the Inquirer to no party, sect, or denomination." By looking at Number 19, page 75, 2d column, 23d line from the top, we think he will find something, looking a great deal like recommending a party, sect, or denomination. The declaration of Theophilus, "For it is God, the Omnipotent Father *in* man, *who will not justify the wicked*," may answer the purpose of making a man famous for absurdity; and we cannot conjecture any other effect which can result from such folly. The Scriptures forsooth, are very imperfect,—the holy men or prophets who wrote in them, were very ignorant,—but we know all about it,—we have got a spirit in us, which is light! Pray, Mr. Theophilus, is there a God or Omnipotent Father *out* of man, who *will* justify the wicked? It would really appear so, according to your construction of the sentence. You likewise speak of 'God out of Christ, being *consuming fire*." Pray, Sir, where did you learn this *stuff*? If the spirit within you teaches this, we assure you, that you have that *old serpent the devil* in you, and not the spirit of truth. If you wish for proof of this, we give it you. Namely,—The Scriptures no where testify that "God out of Christ is a consuming fire,"—and 'if you speak not according to the things written in the book, it is because there is no light in you."

Theophilus in his paragraph number 4, perverts Paul's declaration to the Colossians, i. 25, 26, 27. "Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God, which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God, the mystery, which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints; to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ, in you the hope of glory." It is on such perversions that Theophilus builds his castle, and when truth comes, the fabric totters,—and its builder scolds.

Wishing to convince Theophilus of his great error, we advise him to give a preference to Paul's exposition of his own writings, to that of any other person whatever. See Romans xvi. 25, 26. xi. 25, 26. Ephes. i. 9. iii. 3, 4, 9, 10, 11. The reader by recurring to these passages will find a different doctrine from that taught by Theophilus; who it appears, is for having the very Christ, Omnipotent God and Father in himself. If this could be proved to be the case, we think Theophilus would have much to boast of, but under existing circumstances, we think he is no better than his neighbours: and the mystery, instead of being Christ in Theophilus, is the knowledge which all Christians have, and which is made known unto them, that "in the dispensation of the fulness of times, God will gather together all things in Christ," &c.

We learn from Theophilus' fifth paragraph, that printing a word in *italics* "subverts the sense" of it. About as reasonable, and equally as true, is his declaration, that *the Scriptures hold further, the light in a man's conscience, to be* GOD'S WORD, WITNESS, C[illegible]. [illegible] his sixth paragraph very properly, but [illegible] it is considered, that he be[illegible] he calls it, or a certain some[illegible] uself, to be this Christ, [illegible] difference between him and the Deist, only we think the latter has the most sincerity of the two. Relative to our mistake of names, we inform Theophilus they were printed as they were written. The seventh paragraph is certainly a production in *Polemical* style, and can be made to mean any thing the reader pleases, except the truth. Theophilus first declares, that "God is no where so expressly, as in the *centre* of our soul,"—but like a *great divine*, diplays his talents in the following piece of advice,—"And if you ask me the method and the way to find him in the BOTTOM of your *soul*, I answer,—there is no other but to remove all the hinderances, by casting *out* of your *soul* all *earthly affections*," &c. Although all language is figurative, and words are but *pictures* expressive of our *ideas*, still if the *pictures* are not *true*, and the representation *correct*, they stand in the same relation as respects their value or utility, that a painting would stand, which taken and *intended* for a *picture* or representation of a *house*, should *resemble* a *horse*.

If our correspondent should again complain of a *levity* in our manner, we answer—we would give to every thing its proper name; and we appeal to him, whether he ever heard of a *greater* absurdity, than a "*stone* falling *into* its *centre*?" And to *disengage* one's-self *from* one's-self! Wonderful! Now we have heard of a "person's running away from himself," and something of this kind appears to be our correspondent's meaning. After repeating considerable *nonsense*, our correspondent comes to the truth; by a quotation from the Scripture, which quotation is tortured to death before he closes. We acknowledge, and never have refused our assent to the doctrine, that the way the "Scriptures make us wise unto salvation," is, through faith, or belief in the truth contained in them; and that it is *in* and *of* (too) Christ Jesus. But strange to tell,—Theophilus denies even this, before he closes, and *talks* of a DECREE, &c. We tell Theophilus, that Scripture,—reason,—nor common sense, will support him; and until he produces something better than his own word in proof, we think he will make no proselytes.

Note. Theophilus contends, that a man is born again by a *spirit*, which he boldly and definitively *locates* in a man's *own self* Now, we have one objection to this doctrine. Christ said, 'The wind bloweth where it listeth; and thou hearest the sound

thereof, but canst not tell *whence it cometh*, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." *One* of *two* things must be,—either the Saviour or Theophilus was *mistaken*. For Theophilus has told *where* the Spirit came from, and *located* his spirit, as certainly, as a man could *locate* his neighbour. Now, we have no doubt but Theophilus is in *part* correct. We believe *his spirit* is found, and came from the very *place* he describes. But the Spirit Christ spake of, is another, and a different *Spirit!*

COMMUNICATION.

On Universalism.

My design in the following remarks, is, to show the incorrectness of the principles of those termed Universalists. And, though I am but a young and an inexperienced writer, yet I think there is no need to fear to undertake to confute tenets, which are contradicted on many pages of the word of God. For Jehovah will argue, and not a feeble creature The conceit of a UNIVERSAL RESTITUTION of all intelligible beings whether angels or men, to a state of felicity, who have spent the time allotted to them for probation, in hostility to the government of the Sovereign of all worlds, is as GROUNDLESS as it is GRATAFUL to the SINNER. It is not only in opposition to what the light of reason teaches, but to numerous passages of the Scriptures; and reason certainly is to be followed, as far as it can be supported by the word of God.

That the truth in question is reasonable, appears evident, since the heathen of every age, almost universally believe in a future state of eternal happiness and misery, for which, they consider all mankind as probationers, till death decides their eternal destiny. Does not reason teach us, that sin, which tends to subvert all order, and is in opposition to every thing that is good; that thing which tramples under foot the laws of Jehovah, who is infinite in his perfections, and which, if possible, would dethrone the Majesty of heaven, deserves to be punished as long as God endures to inflict the penalty?

Sin is in direct OPPOSITION to infinite holiness, and, THEREFORE, deserves INFINITE PUNISHMENT. But supposing it were possible for a sinner to be punished in a limited space of time, for all the sins committed while on earth. Can it be possible, since the wicked will continue to add sin to sin, in the regions of wo, for them ever to be restored? Listen to reason, for it will readily answer. But some venture so far as to say, that there is no future punishment, but all after death pass into glory. If this were the case, in what confusion must the earth appear, since the righteous are often pressed down with the greatest affiictions, while the wicked apparently live at ease, and seem to prosper in almost all their undertakings? God is just in all his ways; and therefore, this principle *must* be false. How must those holy beings that surround the throne of God be filled with astonishment, to see man, a guilty worm of the dust already under condemnation, use such vain arguments in his own defence, daring to circumscribe the desert of his own transgression? Yet, at the same time, how must they admire the long suffering of Jehovah, who permits vile mortals thus to insult him, without immediately executing his judgments upon them? Supposing a number of men were found guilty of high treason against the United States, and on their being informed of the penalty which they had incurred by their guilt, they contradict it, saying, that it is altogether impossible for the laws of a government as mild as this, to require a penalty so severe, and thereupon they prescribe to their judge what a government so mild requires? Who would not be disgusted at such conduct? Then, O vain man, thou who art guilty of high treason against the King of kings, wilt thou dare to prescribe what ought to be done by the Judge of all the earth? Know, that thou art guilty; and unless reconciled to God through the merits of a Saviour, thy doom is inevitable!

A universal restitution, as before observed, is contradicted by numerous passages in the Scriptures; which assert in as *strong* terms the everlasting misery of the wicked, as they do the eternal happiness of the righteous; and if the misery of the wicked is limited, as some would fain think, the felicity of the righteous also, must be so too, for the very same expressions which are the most forcible that could have been adopted to convey an idea of eternal duration, have been used to express the continuation of each of their conditions.

When Christ at last shall come to judge the world, his language will not be to the wicked, Depart into a temporary fire, till prepared for a realm of bliss; but mark the awful words which the Judge will utter,—"Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt. xxv. 41. These the Saviour says, speaking of the wicked, shall go away into everlasting punishment; he adds, but the righteous into life eternal." Matt. xxv. 46. O Reader, be not deluded; for there is *no salvation* for those who die impenitent; the word of God asserts, that "the smoke of their torments ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they shall have no rest, day nor night, Rev. xiv. 11.

There is not the LEAST hope for a FUTURE restoration to be derived from the Scriptures; but on the contrary, Christ assures us, that the fire of HELL shall never be quenched. He repeatedly tells us, as if to impress it on our minds, that it is better to break off from our sins, however dear they may be to us, and to enter into life, than to be cast into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched; he says, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. Mark ix. 43 to 48 inclusive. Nothing unclean shall ever enter the New Jerusalem. NONE of the unregenerate sons of Adam shall walk the golden streets. For he that cannot lie, has said, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," Matt xviii. 3. He says we must be born again, or we cannot enter the kingdom of God, John iii 3, 5, 6, 7. Can any one be so vain as to say, that this change can take place after death? A supposition like this cannot be supported; and it would be absurd in the highest degree, to suppose it possible for beings consigned to the region of wo, deprived of the influence of the Spirit, to become renewed, since their enmity to God while on earth, led them to resist his friendly operations. The SCRIPTURES as well as REASON attest the contrary; we learn from THEM, that those who come to this awful end will be so far from becoming RECONCILED to God, that THEY will become mere devils, who will spend an eternity in CURSING and BLASPHEMING their Maker's name, and will thus be ever adding fuel to the fire. This TRUTH no one will DENY, who believes the words of our Lord, for he has said, in that furnace of fire "there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Matt. xiii. 50.

If it were possible for those who die impenitent to be restored to a state of felicity, Christ could not have spoken the truth, when he said concerning Judas, "It had been GOOD for that man if he had not been born," Matt. xxvi. 24. For it certainly would have been BETTER for even Judas to be BORN, were it possible for him ever to be restored to a state of felicity.

But if that period is to arrive, when God will admit malignant men and devils, who then will be employed in blaspheming his name into the world of bliss, then the time is coming, when HEAVEN itself will be converted into HELL, and become the habitation of unholy beings; and he who the Scriptures tells us is unchangeable, will, (I almost shudder to make the expression) in NATURE become a devil; and look upon sin with impunity, and take peculiar delight in that which he now abhors. That God who is styled LOVE, will then begin to hate his followers; and they who put their trust in him will find all their hopes were but vain.

But let us consider the pernicious effects of a notion like this;—it directly tends to obliterate that sense of the exceeding evil nature of sin, of the inflexible justice of God, and the truth of the awful doom with which he threatens the wicked, of which the best of men have but a faint idea. If the word of God we take as our guide, we shall be led into no such gross errors,—that assures us, that "there remains no other sacrifice for sin," no future relief for those who sin away their day of grace; "but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.' Heb. x. 26, 27. Christ asserts, "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and MANY there be that go in there at. Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.' Matt. vii. 13, 14. Is the destruction he here speaks of but a temporary punishment? No one who candidly consults the Scriptures will pretend so. He tells us but FEW enter in at the strait gate, and if so, those who die in their sins are inevitably lost. If this is not the case, what did our Saviour mean, when he said, "What is a man profited if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Matt. xvi. 26. Can that soul be lost, that is to be restored to a state of happiness? CERTAINLY NOT. NO ONE having READ the SCRIPTURES could ever have had a NOTION so erroneous, as that of an idea of UNIVERSAL RESTITUTION, had they not been seduced by the perverters of truth. O YE DECEIVERS, there is an awful wo denounced against you, who go about in SHEEP'S CLOTHING, but who are within RAVENING WOLVES. At the close of the book of Revelation, we are informed, that "if any man should add to that book, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in that book. And if any man shall take away from the words of that book, that God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city," which I CONSIDER as applicable to the WHOLE of the Bible! The sin of perverting the word of God, appears to me to be equally as heinous, as that of *adding* to, or diminishing from it. Then, I entreat of *you* who have been guilty of this crime, to take *warning* before for ever too late, for the time is fast approaching, when *you*, who have been guilty of this awful sin must give an account for it, with all the deeds done in the body.

AMATOR VERITATIS.

ANSWER.

It is with mingled emotions of pity and astonishment, that we have read this production of our "Young and inexperienced" correspondent, which betrays the most profound ignorance of man, of the Scriptures, and of the character and attributes of our heavenly Father. We understand he is a *student* at *divinity*, and under the *tuition* of a Presbyterian clergyman in Morristown, N. J., and we feel justified in saying, that his *Tutor* ought to be *ashamed* for the *ignorance* of his *pupil*. He is indeed in his *pupilage* as respects his knowledge of the scriptures, although we think him *far* advanced in the *science* of *contradiction* and absurdity! We should have been better pleased had his *Master* stepped into the ranks *himself*, and we cannot but expect, and with confidence too, that he will, from a conviction of duty, assist his pupil, who we assure him, is engaged in very *unequal* combat. Our weapons are not *carnal*,—we wield the "sword of the *Spirit*, the word of God, quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and *is* a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

It would have been becoming in our correspondent, had he informed his readers *of* the *principles*, which he is pleased to think, "an inexperienced writer may undertake to *refute* without fear;" and which *he* says, "are contradicted on many pages of the word of God." We shall not leave the reader in the dark relative to the principles of our *student*. We shall not say, that they "are *contradicted* on *many* pages of the word of God,"—but we say, they are unsupported by, and contradicted on EVERY page of the *word of God*, and by *every rational* and *humane* principle in *creation!* Nay more,—we assure our 'inexperienced writer,' that if he will grant us opportunity, he shall very soon 'experience' the power of truth in the refutation of his errors, and if he will *persist* in *error* and *falsehood*, it shall not be for want of means of knowing *better!*

The principles of our correspondent, agreeably to his *own* exhibition of them, are the principles of John Calvin; and we presume, he means when he says, of the principles of Universalism, that they are "contradicted on many pages of the word of God," that they are contradicted on many pages of *Calvin's Institutes;* for except in them, or in sermons

written by his disciples, or some other human and illegitimate production, no evidence or proof can be found in support of his unwarrantable assertions.

Our correspondent in his first paragraph, says, 'The *Universal restitution* of all intelligible beings, whether angels or men,to a state of felicity, &c. is as *groundless* as it is grateful to the *sinner*." Now we are quite willing to acknowledge, that the doctrine of the"Restitution of all things,"is just as groundless as it is *grateful* to the *sinner!*" How *grateful* is this doctrine to the *sinner*? Enter our state prisons, and houses of correction, and our word for it, not one can be *found* who will *profess* his *unqualified belief* in this doctrine! Our correspondent has introduced *data*, on which we are quite willing to *test* the *truth* of his *own* declarations. We request our correspondent to try his criterion; first put the question to himself, and then, to all the *sinners* of his acquaintance, and *if* he does not find TEN in *favour* of *his* doctrine of *endless misery*, to ONE in favour of the 'Restitution of all things,' we are willing to acknowledge, that *we* are *wrong*, and he is *right!* We think our correspondent is bound to try his rule, and see, whether this fine, pleasant, easy, agreeable doctrine which *he* thinks is so *very wicked*, is 'grateful to the sinner,' and if he finds it is not grateful, we think he will be obliged to acknowledge,that of all agreeable wicked things, it is the only one that sinners do not like! And farther, we ask him, if even a *good man* like himself would find the doctrine of *fire* and *brimstone*, and *endless misery*, grateful to his FEELINGS, if he was persuaded he should suffer the *one*, and *endure* the other *for ever without end*? We think he would not. And if he declares the contrary, we tell him to his teeth, that he does *not* know what *is good* for him; nay more,—if *endless misery* would be grateful to his feelings, and he were to be gratified, how long would he continue to express his gratitude for the enjoyment after it *commenced*? Our correspondent likewise says, this doctrine 'is not only in opposition to what the light of reason teaches, but to numerous passages of the Scriptures; and reason certainly is to be followed, as far as it can be supported by the word of God." *We* are *willing* to take this as a rule, and try the question. Is it reasonable to suppose, that the difference in the actions and conduct of men for the short term of twenty, and even one hundred years, should make a difference in a future state in their conditions, for innumerable millions of millions of ages in point of duration, when at the same time the Scriptures declare, that "there is *none good*, no *not one;* that they are together become unprofitable," &c., and an inspired apostle confessed himself the 'chief of sinners,' and asked the question, "Are we better than they? No, in *no wise*, for we have before *proved*, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that they are all under *sin!*" Romans iii. Now, how far can reason be supported by Scripture?

Our young correspondent, in his second paragraph, says, "That the truth (endless misery) in question, is reasonable, appears evident, since the *heathen* of every age almost believe in a future state of eternal happiness and misery, for which they consider all mankind as probationers, till death decides their eternal destiny." Although he has assumed as truth, a position without any proof, still with a view to give him all the chance we can, and to deal gently with him, we will admit his premises, at least, so far, as to test them by the Scriptures, and leave him to prove them true at his leisure. At all events he has admitted the heathen to be orthodox. And if he could prove his premises, we think it would give great relief to the almost *bursting hearts* of the members of our Missionary Societies, who are 'seized with a noble frenzy,' and who believe, or at *least pretend* to believe, that "thousands of millinos of the heathen" are dying ignorant of a 'future state,' and will be endlessly miserable, because they do not believe in the damnation of their neighbours!!! Reader, we request you to look at the premises of our student,—examine them,—and then, look we entreat you, at the conclusions which are furnished, not by us, but by the Scriptures. Psalm cxxxv. 15, &c. "The idols of the heathen are *silver* and *gold*, the work of *men's* hands. They have *mouths*, but they *speak not*, &c *They* that *make them* are like unto them," &c. Quere. Do these idols teach a future state of rewards and punishment? Jeremiah x. 2. "Thus saith the Lord, learn not the way of the heathen, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the *heathen are dismayed at them.* For the customs of the people (heathen) *are vain!*" This passage needs no comment! Ezek. xx. 32. "Ye say, We will be as the heathen, as the families of the countries, to *serve wood and stone.*" What do *wood* and *stone* teach? We presume there is no person of any knowledge of the Scriptures, who will deny that all mankind are there designated as Jews or Heathens. We, therefore, refer our correspondent to the most enlightened nation of heathens, the Athenians, and to the account of Paul's preaching to them of a *future state;* see Acts xvii. 32. "And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked, and others said, We will hear thee again of this," &c. Now, what are we to think of our correspondent's appeal to the heathen, as authority to prove a *future state of endless misery?* For ourselves, we think he is richly entitled to all he can get from them. Had he said, the heathen were all believers in a future 'restitution of all things,' and proved his premises, the case would have been different. And we tell him candidly, such evidence would not have been received by us very favourably. This, however, is not the case. Our correspondent asks, "Does not *reason teach us*, that sin, which tends to subvert all order,and is in opposition to every thing that is good, &c. deserves to be punished as long as *God endures* to inflict the penalty." Supposing our correspondent had considered, first, that if sin has this dreadful 'tendency to subvert *all* order," &c., his premises cannot be true, that sin has a *tendency* to subvert all order, without *endangering* the very existence of all order; and if sin is infinite, as he pretends, he arrogates to an *abstract principle, infinite power*,—nay more,—for contending that God's power is *infinite*, and sin likely to subvert even that, which must be the case, or all order cannot be in danger from it; he would prove, if words have any meaning, that sin cannot be punished. If he objects to this, let him decide, when *infinity opposes infinity*, and tell, if he can, who will obtain the victory! Let our correspondent think a moment,—let him try and conceive of sin, and the sinner, being distinct and separate,—we tell him to his head, if he cannot prove this, and clearer too, than he has proved his premises, so *far*, he has inevitably pronounced his *own eternal damnation!* If words have any meaning, he cannot on his ground avoid this, to him *confounding conclusion!!!* We ask this *novice* in theology, Where will your sin be, and how will it be punished, when that period shall arrive, and the thing spoken of be accomplished, which the prophet Daniel predicted, ix. 24. of Christ, that he should "finish the transgression, and make an end of sins?"

Our refuter, in his third paragraph, says, "Sin is in direct opposition to infinite holiness, and therefore, deserves infinite punishment." 'Therefore,' Pray, *wherefore?* Supposing we were to say, endless misery is in direct opposition to infinite happiness, and therefore, deserves *endless punishment.* Punish sin, and torment it till your heart aches, but my *good man*, mind how you torment the sinner,—and for a good reason too, for we verily believe you are a sinner yourself! Paul made a distinction between the sin and the sinner,—see Romans vii. 17. "Now it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." Our correspondent adds,' But supposing it were possible for a sinner to be punished in a limited space of time, for all the sins committed while on earth; can it be possible, since the wicked will continue to add sin to sin in the regions of wo, for them ever to be restored?" Stop, friend,—You have begged the question long enough. Where is your evidence to prove that the wicked, or sinners will add sin to sin, in a future state? We have often heard as an objection from orthodox folks, when reconciliation to God was mentioned, 'There is no work nor device, wisdom, nor knowledge, in the grave to which we are hastening." But they can sin, it seems, without working, &c. The Scriptures speak of giving account of deeds done *in* the body; but not *out* of the body! Our refuter adds, "Listen to reason, for it will readily answer." Granted,—and to Scripture, for that will answer too. Again, he says," But some venture so far, as to say, that there is no future punishment, &c.; If this was the case, in what confusion must earth appear?' &c. Or in other words,—'If I who am good, and have borne the heat and burden of the day, receive but one penny, and he that came at the eleventh hour, receives a penny also, how great the injustice? Supposing this is admitted, friend, where is your remedy? On the whole, we think you must submit to your *hard fate*, and endure the dreadful disappointment of seeing your neighbour as happy as yourself. 'For God is just in all his ways, (and all being sinners alike) therefore,this (your) principle must be false." Our correspondent goes on in this, his third paragraph, *begging* the question, and drawing his conclusions, and asks, 'Supposing a number of men were found guilty of high treason against the United States, and on being informed of the penalty which they had incurred by this guilt, they contradict it, saying, that it is altogether impossible for the laws of a government as mild as this to require a penalty so severe, and thereupon, they prescribe to their judge, what a government so mild requires? Who would not be disgusted at such conduct?' To this we answer, well, what of all this; do you introduce this as a figure to illustrate man in his relation to his Maker? If so, a little examination of your premises will test the correctness of your conclusions! And first,---If 100 men were found guilty by the laws of the United States, of high treason, &c., and 50 of them were executed, and the remainder exalted to offices of honour, &c., and those who are honoured and saved were as guilty as those who were executed, it would, we think, require an abler advocate than our correspondent,to defend the injustice of the government. Second. Our correspondent adds,"know that thou art guilty; and unless reconciled to God, through the merits of a Saviour thy doom is inevitable." Now the Scriptures declaring, that "Jesus Christ by the grace of God tasted death for every man; and is the propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*," spoils our student's premises; and his declaration, that 'unless reconciled to God by the merits of a Saviour, thy doom is inevitable,' places the criminal in a condition, from which his own efforts never can avail him any thing; and to call upon him to reconcile himself, after making this declaration, would look very much like a contradiction. What must these men who are guilty of high treason do? *Ans.* To be orthodox, those who go to be hung, must confess they ought to be hung; and those who are *saved*, must likewise confess they ought to be *hung*. Now, it would require at least, a different kind of logic, from any we ever heard of, to prove that both confessed the truth; and the judge who condemned one, and pardoned another, to be just, or honourable. We request our correspondent to ponder a little upon this. The doctrine, that those who are *saved* deserve endless punishment,---and those who are damned cannot deserve any more; if this were admitted, it would appear, that they did not have justice done them,---therefore, according to this strange hypothesis, the saved *deserve* to be damned,---and the damned *alone* have justice done them! We know, that our opponents, ashamed of their premises, and disgusted at their own conclusions, will pretend, that the merits of the Redeemer being only applied to, or received by, a part, a part only can in justice be saved,---and this is proved, as plain, as that two and two make *forty*, by Calvin, and numerous writers, who have excelled in the science of absurdity. We inform our young correspondent, that the Scriptures no where say, that Christ did *not* die for the *whole*, and that he died for a *part;* but expressly the reverse,—that he died for *all*,---for *every man*,---for the *world!* And we wish him, and all others, who are unbelievers in the 'restitution of all things,' to remember, that in future, unless they bring better evidence of the truth of their doctrine, than their own assertions, we shall teach them their duty as logicians and theologians, and in language they may not relish.

(To be continued.)

To Correspondents.

An Impartialist, Mysticus, Timotheus, and Pothos are received, and shall be published.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1820. NO. 28.

An Exposition of Luke xvi.

(Continued.)

The Parable of the rich man and Lazarus.

The strong figures introduced by our Saviour in this parable, are peculiarly gratifying to unbelievers in the salvation of God, who, without reason, or analogy, and pleased with the *hell*, *flame*, and *torment*, there spoken of, use the terms, and appropriate them with the liberality, and about the same success as respects *their* cause, that a *quack* does his infallible remedies. It is yet a disputable point, even among those who lay claim to orthodoxy, whether this part of our Saviour's speech, as recorded by Luke, is to be considered a *parable*, or received according to its *literal* import. We shall leave them the quiet possession of their own notions, and let them dispose of the absurdity between themselves. There is, however, an understanding of it common to both, and equally pleasant to both; for they mutually agree in this particular, that *hell-fire and torments* is to be the portion of the sinner in a *future* state; and this is resolved from both their views of the subject,—*one* declaring, that as a *parable*, the *punished* are *exhibited* as a *warning* to the world; and the *other*, that it is a *literal* narrative of God's judgment and displeasure manifested in the eternal damnation and misery of the offender, and the felicity of the righteous, &c.; and is held up as a *beacon* to admonish the *sinner*, by showing him the *consequence* of sin; and to *stimulate* the *righteous*, by the *happiness* to be found and enjoyed in '*Abraham's* bosom.' Although our exposition of the *parable* of the *unjust steward*, and the manifest *connexion* which exists between the two *parables* are unanswerable objections against their views of the subject, still with a view to afford inquirers after truth an extensive and plain exhibition of our Saviour's declarations, and to expose the absurd contradictions which surround and crowd upon every part of the doctrine which orthodox divines have squeezed out of it, we shall mention in order, *difficulties*, which, with all their zeal, they have been obliged to *stumble* against, and which continue to stop their progress in all their *pious* attempts to remove them. They contend, that *every* man will be *judged*, and his *future* state *determined*, by the *deeds* done *in* the *body*, whether *good* or *bad*. Supposing we grant them this part of *their* statement? What follows? *Ans.* Their views of this last part of the 16th chap of Luke, are contradicted and defeated by *themselves*, independent of any other objection; for call it a *parable*, or what you will, there is not *one* word said about the *sins* of the *rich man*, or the *righteousness* of *Lazarus!* What! Is a man to be *damned* and made miserable without end, and his condition exposed to the world to *deter* others, and his *crimes* which produced the horrid catastrophe, not so much as even *hinted at*? And a man *rewarded* with endless felicity and happiness, and held up to mankind as an *example* to stimulate others, and *his virtues* not even *mentioned*? Nay more,—the recipient of heaven is described as glutted with joy, and supine from satiety, unmindful of every thing, and absorbed with his own self,—and the other, the wretch in *hell*, as feelingly alive to the welfare of *others*, and his mouth full of sentiments and expressions of solicitude for his brethren! True, he was suffering, and his *fears* were *more* for *others* than for himself,—the *good* man in heaven was *happy*, and not a wish escaped his lips for the happiness of others: not one benevolent expression did he utter, not a word; all was absorbed in self, and he could be pronounced *miserable positively*, were not *negative* happiness laid in the balance! But, says the objector, catching at the last *straw* within his grasp, *Why, he was rich!* Now we ask,—Is it a *crime* to be *rich*? If so, remember, the unjust steward's *lord* is described as a 'RICH MAN!!!' This, we think, is an *overwhelming* objection against the *last* effort of orthodoxical *quibblers*. And it is far from improbable, to suppose, that Christ, with a view to make the way of the transgressor more hard, and to mark with *strong* distinctions the different features of doctrine by the *figures* he *introduced*; he purposely, and with an eye to the *future* Gentile believers in *his* salvation, made choice of this remarkable phraseology, which, like an ancient land-mark, defines and explains to the candid mind the disposition of mercy which his heavenly Father has in store for a *lost*, *benighted* world. The *works* of the *creature* are not only kept out of sight, and not suffered to be even *hinted* at as a *step* to *heaven*, but the creature is *positively* described under *figures*, which, in their *relative* connexion, by *analogy*, militate against *even* the possibility of *misconstruction* to a benevolent mind, although they are a *full repast* to the *Pharisee*, who, when he cannot glut *sufficiently* upon his *own* merits, will *fill himself* by way of *deserts* with the *crimes* of his *neighbours*. On the whole, we think a candid person who reads the expositions of *believers* in endless misery and *unbelievers* in the salvation of God for a *lost world*, must acknowledge, that they, in attempting to *expound*, *confound*,—and they introduce *two* difficulties, where they remove *one*. Their view of this *parable*, among other strange contradictions, has the following,—according to their hypothesis, the damned in hell spend their time in *cursing* and *blaspheming* God, and in the indulgence of every *malignant* passion, '*becoming mere devils*;' and wonderful to relate, the *rich man* in *hell* is described to be in the *exercise* of the most *humane* and *benevolent* feelings for his *brethren*, and expresses the utmost *solicitude* for their *happiness!* We must, however, do them the justice to say, that even this, is to them a kind of *negative* consistency; for being obliged to *admit*, that sentiments of compassion and benevolence are taught by the Saviour, and of consequence, being *durable*, must *continue* to exist; and declaring that the *inhabitants* of *heaven* will at a future time be *divested* of the *weakness* of natural *affection*, and those (in their opinion, we presume, *ungodly*) *sensations*, which are sometimes experienced on beholding those who are *dear* to us, in *pain* and *suffering*, they are *obliged* to *banish* these *degrading* feelings from *heaven*, and for want of a *worse* place, they consign them to HELL! This is a truth, which may be unpleasant to an *orthodox* mind, especially, when it is stripped of the false gloss and tinsel with which a miserable sophistry has vainly attempted to garnish and brighten it. And *blind* indeed must that man be, who deceived by his prejudices, considers the '*bosom of Abraham*' as the heavenly *mansions*, which Christ went to *prepare* for the *possession* which he *purchased* with his *blood!*

'*There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day.*'

The '*certain rich man*,' is a figure of the *Jews*, who were represented by their high *priest*, whose *dress*, composed of *purple* and *fine linen*, is chosen by the Saviour to illustrate the *parable*. To 'them were committed the oracles of God.' Romans iii. 2. The Jews, or Israelites, were the peculiar people of God, in contradistinction to all the other nations which dwelt on the face of the earth; and their *riches* which they *possessed*, and which were withheld from the heathen nations, were *spiritual*, and are particularized in the book of Numbers, vi. 22 to 27th verses inclusive. 'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. And they shall *put my name* upon the children of Israel, and *I will bless them*.' Exodus xx. 24. 'An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace-offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen: In all places where *I record my name*, *I will come unto thee*, *and I will bless thee*." Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, x. 1, 2, 3, 4. 'Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud; all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and *did all eat* the same *spiritual* meat; and did all *drink* the same *spiritual* drink; for *they drank* of that *spiritual Rock* that followed them; and that *Rock* was *Christ*.' The Jews, therefore, were emphatically *rich* in *spiritual* blessings; and that they are prefigured in the *parable*, representatively by their *high priest*, and he particularly described, is evident, from the account of his *vestments*, given in Exodus xxviii. 2, 4, 5, 8, 15, &c. where it is specified of his garments, that they should be of '*purple and fine twined linen*.' And the *high priest* being the *representative* of the people, is proved in the 21st and 29th verses. The phraseology of the *parable*, therefore, is illustrated, and its application to the Jews, in the character of their *high priest*, necessarily obvious. "*They fared sumptuously*" *in spiritual things*, '*every day*.'

"*And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores*" The phraseology of this verse of the parable, is in a remarkable manner explanatory in its *figures* of the *person*, who is a *figure* of the *Gentile* nations. As the *rich man* is the representative of the *Jews*, so the *beggar* is the representative of the *Gentiles*. And the *contrast* in their conditions, with respect to their *spiritual* riches and knowledge of their heavenly Father, is designated and explained in the strongest possible terms. It is declared, *not* that the *beggar* of his own accord, *voluntarily* went and laid *himself* at the *rich* man's *gate*, but that he *was laid* there. This figure is descriptive of the condition in which the providence of God placed the Gentiles. Solomon says, "'Wisdom crieth in the *openings* of the *gates*;" but it is "*in* the *city* that she *uttereth* her *words*." The *beggar* or Gentiles, were placed *without* the *gate*, at a distance, and *poor* indeed, as respected their knowledge of the revelation of God. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, xi. 12. describes the *poverty* of the Gentiles, and declares of them, respecting their condition previous to their obtaining knowledge of the salvation of God, 'That at that time ye were *without* Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, (lying at the rich man's gate,) and strangers from the *covenants* of *promise*, having *no hope*, (desiring to be *fed* with *crumbs*, &c.) and without God in the world.' Paul's account is in perfect harmony with the parable. It has been observed, that the difference which exists between the *human* and the *brute* creation, is in no particular so obvious, as in *reason*, the prerogative of man. This, it is presumed, may be called *abstract* reasoning; and we shall take the liberty to differ, at least, so far as to say, that the *desires* which in uninterrupted succession generate *in*, and emanate *from*, the human *heart*, mark with unequaled emphasis, and draw the *line* with unequivocal exactness between *man* and the *brute*. There is at least, a *similarity* in the *reason* of man and the undescribable *instinct* of the *brute*. But the *desires* of *man*, if judged by their *effects*, which would fill volumes to describe, and which exhibit him on the theatre of life absorbed in erratic pursuits and chimeras, having for their object a duration, compared with which, his present existence is but a point, and an *end*, commensurate with the magnitude of his wishes, all similarity vanishes, and comparison in this thing, is a term, rendered of necessity obsolete. If these premises are true, and we think they are, man, especially in social life, is the victim of his

desires; and what at first view may seem an incongruity, a *certain* sacrifice to *uncertain* expectations, the fruitful concomitant of unchastened *desire*, and unbounded *wishes*. While the Gentiles were *aliens* and at the *gate*, they were in possession of *social*, but not *religious* life. Let the word *religion* be received according to its proper import, and a man be considered *religious* in proportion as he is *reunited* to his Father God; and this *reunion* be defined to exist, only in proportion as man is *like* his merciful, beneficent, and forgiving heavenly *Father;* and the condition of the Gentiles, without God in the world, and *ignorant* of their *origin* and *destination*, is abundantly manifest. Their *passions* produced their *gods; pride* and *fear* erected their altars; and *ignorance* presided in their *temples!* The only *light* which irradiated their worship, was the *fires* which gleamed from the faggots when their *children* were offered to devils,—and the only answer of peace which they received, was the gloomy hope of satiating with the fruit of their bodies, the vengeance of the demons they worshipped. Although *pride*, which is inherent in the breasts of all men, might induce the Gentiles to *boast* of their pre-eminence, still the insufficiency of their dark and doubtful state would, unwished crowd upon their minds, and uncertainty relative to their origin and future destination, give birth to a curiosity and solicitude, they neither could suppress, nor command. They were, therefore, *poor*, and *blind*, and *naked;* destitute of *hope*, and without any God, save the *creature* of their imaginations, who was *gendered* in *fear*, and whose fancied existence served only to perpetuate their bondage and make them miserable. In this *chaos* of doubt, this dark delirium of uncertainty, they would receive with avidity even the '*crumbs* which fell from the *rich man's table.*' The proportion which the smallest *crumb* bears to the *plentiful* provision which is furnished for the subsistence of a family, is far *greater*, than was the knowledge of the Gentiles, compared to the smallest portion of the *revelation* which God made of himself to the Jews, the '*rich man.*'

"*Moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores.*" There is an apparent incongruity in this phraseology when considered in connexion, the *figure*, with the *thing* personated or intended. The word *dogs*, occurs *six* times in the New Testament. See Matt. 7. 6. and 15, 26, 27. Mark vii. 28 Luke xvi. 21. Phil. iii. 2. Rev. xxii. 15. The word *dogs*, as first quoted, was evidently used by Christ to designate *unbelievers*. The second, 15, 26. we think is a pointed allusion to the *Gentiles;* to one of whom Christ then addressed himself. The quotation from Mark, &c., is the same; and the *woman* declared to be a *Greek*. That in Luke is the subject under consideration. In Phil. we think Paul intended by *dogs*, unbelievers; especially those, who possessed a *persecuting* spirit. The passage in Rev. we think unquestionably applies, from its connexion, to all persecuting unbelievers; who are without *faith* in Christ. The preceding verse speaks of entering into the *city* (the New Jerusalem,) through the *gates*. These *gates* are *twelve* in number, and we presume, are figurative of the twelve *apostles* of Christ; and entering *through* the gates, of *believing* through the instrumentality of the preaching of the apostles, &c. Consequently, from the *general* application made of the *term*, by our Saviour in the passages quoted, when he addressed the *Greek woman*, it is not only proper, but necessary to understand the *term* in the parable as applicable to the Gentiles, of whom the *Grecian* and *Roman philosophers*, in particular, were, we think, alluded to. The fact, that a *dog licking a sore*, or wound, is beneficial, and gives momentary relief to the sufferer, is illustrative of the figure in the *parable*. The writings of Socrates, Plato and Seneca, and others, may be considered as affording a partial satisfaction to that curiosity inherent in all men, respecting their origin and destination. And the inquietude, the certain consequence of ignorance and idolatry, and which was the companion of the *poor man*, or Gentiles, received at least but an uncertain and momentary relief from the *conjectures*, of even the wisest and best informed of the ancient philosophers.

(To be continued.)

To the Editor of the Universalist Magazine.

Rev. Sir,—I observed in your last Magazine, an *Extract of a letter written by* John Calvin, *in* 1561, *to the* Marquis Paet, *high Chamberlain to the King of Navarre*, selected from the *N. Y. Gospel Herald*. It struck me as an effectual refutation of all the attempts to defend Calvin from the charge of possessing a most ungodly, persecuting spirit. But it seems very desirable that the public should be certified of the authenticity of the letter from which the abominable extract is taken; for the Calvinists manifest a determination to screen their great leader from the imputation of cruelty, even in his conduct towards *Servetus*. See the following extract from the Life of Calvin, in *Brewster's Encyclopedia*.

"It is not true, however, that Calvin showed any undue eagerness to procure the destruction of Servetus. Much has been alleged to this purpose by his enemies; but it has no foundation in fact. He acted in this case as he uniformly did, from no party view, or paltry resentments, but from a strong sense of duty, and an ardent zeal for truth. What he did in it, indeed, he did with his characteristic steadiness and zeal. It is evident, however, that his chief anxiety was not to punish Servetus, but to make him retract his error. He tried most earnestly and patiently to prevent the catastrophe which followed; but this design was frustrated by the obstinacy, the violence and impious language of Servetus himself. Even after this unhappy man was condemned, Calvin felt for him; and though he could not get the execution of the law suspended, endeavoured, but in vain, to procure a remission of the more harsh and painful parts of the sentence. These observations are made, not to exculpate Calvin, nor justify the use of fire and faggot in defence of the gospel, but merely to do justice to the memory of this great reformer, and to moderate the hostility and lessen the confidence of his enemies."

Through the medium of your Magazine, Sir, I would submit my request to the Editor of the 'N. Y. Gospel Herald,' for the circumstances which may establish the genuineness of the above-mentioned letter.

B——.

Boston Universalist Magazine.

In answer to the above, we have only to say, that we copied the *extract* in question from a *Calvinistic* publication, entitled '*A General History of the* Baptist Denomination *in America, and other parts of the world. By* David Benedict, A. M. *Pastor of the* Baptist Church *in Pawtucket, R. I.*' &c. 'Boston, *printed by* Lincoln *and* Edmands, *No. 53 Cornhill.* 1813.'

The subject is introduced in Vol. I. Page 184, as follows.

"*Michael Servetus.* This unhappy man was a Spaniard by birth, and lost his life at Geneva by means of the famous John Calvin. He was not immediately connected with the Baptists we have been describing, but as no account of him has yet been given, this seems the most proper place to say a few things respecting him. The death of this unfortunate man produced very lively emotions both of pity and resentment in the breasts of many, who were not altogether in favour of his religious opinions.

Many have written accounts of this much injured man, and uttered the severest rebukes against Calvin and his party, by whom he was committed to the flames. Robinson has entered somewhat largely into his history in his Researches, under the Article, *The Church of Navarre and Biscay;* but our limits will permit us to give only the brief outlines of the character and sufferings of this famous Baptist. He was born at Villa Neuva in Arragon, in Spain, not long after the year 1500. He was bred to physic, but he was early inclined to religious studies, and at the age of eighteen he became an author. His first publication was designed to oppose the doctrine of the Trinity. The errors of Servetus on this and some other subjects we lament. But this does not hinder us from pitying his fate, and detesting the persecuting intrigues which cost him his life. Servetus passed through various fortunes, and published a number of works, all of which we must pass over. While he was studying at the University at Paris, he became acquainted with Calvin, who was nearly of his age. This was about twenty years before he was burnt at Geneva.

From Paris, Servetus went to Lyons, where he met with Peter Palmier, a Catholic and Archbishop of Vienna in Dauphine. The Archbishop being a lover of learned men, and fond of Servetus, pressed him to go to Vienna and practise physic, and offered him an apartment in his palace. The doctor accepted his invitation, and thirteen years lived safe and happy, under the auspices of his Catholic patron. This prelate seems to be one of those, of whom there have been numbers in the Catholic Church, who think freely, but who do not act consistently, who inwardly disapprove of their own corrupt system, but who, for reasons best known to themselves, continue to defend it. The reformers of that day could not conceive how a Catholic Archbishop and an Anabaptist Doctor could live in peace in different apartments in the same palace. The enemies of Servetus envied his felicity, and plotted his ruin. A prosecution was commenced against him, and he was cast into prison; but he soon, by the indulgence of the jailer, made his escape and concealed himself four months, no body knows where. The prosecution was carried on in his absence; he was condemned to be burnt alive in a slow fire, and he was actually burnt in effigy. Being thus hunted by his enemies, this persecuted man next determined on going to Naples, in hope of settling there in the practice of his profession. It is supposed that he was induced to this measure by a Spanish nobleman, named John Valdesius, who was the secretary to the King of Naples, and who had embraced the principles of the Anabaptists.* He took his way through Geneva, and kept close for fear of discovery. While he waited for a boat to cross the lake, Calvin, by some means, got intelligence of his arrival, and although it was Sunday, yet he prevailed upon the chief syndich to arrest and imprison him. The proceedings against him are too lengthy to be related here, but the issue of them was, that on the 27th of October, 1553, this unfortunate man, with many aggravating circumstances, was burnt alive at Geneva for heresy." A multitude of testimonies go to prove that Calvin was at the head of this barbarous affair. But omitting all others, I will transcribe a part of a letter written by him in 1561, to the Marquis Paet, high Chamberlain to the king of Navarre.†"

COMMUNICATION.

Infidelity Considered.

Having premised that nothing of the world, or of God can be known to men, but by their relative spirits, and shown the office of these spirits, that the *elder* shall serve the *younger;* or in other words, that the spirit of man is such that it is to be regenerated by the Spirit of God, and that he is an infidel who has not this Spirit: For saith Scripture testimony, he that hath not the Spirit of Christ is none of his.

Now to draw conclusions from these premises let us proceed. "By their fruits shall ye know them; men do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles. A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit; neither can a good tree bring forth evil fruit." Make the tree good, and its fruit will be good. Men do not, neither can they of themselves, bring forth any thing that is good. Of myself, saith Christ, I can do nothing. But these spirits are the sources of fruit terrestrial, or celestial; and he is characterized a good or a bad man, an infidel, or a believer, a devil or a saint, according to the reign of these spirits, and not according to lip confession thereof. Thus simply we have come to the source from whence arises, or is derived to man, his essential good or real evil. Had man no capacity for the acceptation of any, but a terrestrial spirit, he could no more transgress a divine command, than the beasts of the field. But that he may be an heir of immortality and eternal life, his beneficent Creator has organized him for the reception of his own blessed Spirit. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son for a light to the world, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. Before Abraham was I am," saith Christ

* † Robinson's Researches, p. 348.

to the contending Jews; and further tells his disciples of the people,"If I had not come and spake unto them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloak for their sin,"—as much as to say, if man had no other manifestation than the spirit of the world, no further obedience would have been required, and consequently, in this he could not have transgressed; but now, having this in such a way, as to be qualified to receive a celestial Divine Spirit, and by its reception, enabled to obey its dictates, man is capable of sinning; and actually commits sin just in the same degree as he counteracts this Spirit; for he is accountable for what he *has*, and *not* for what he has *not*.

" In the beginning was the Word, the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God; all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men;and is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." John further testifies,—that John the Baptist was sent from God; but was *not* that *light*, but came to bear witness *of* that light. So it may be said of all Scripture given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that (not only) the man of God may be perfected, thoroughly furnished unto all good works; but the unbelievers may be directed by its testimony to this life, which is the only true light in which God may be known, the soul enlivened and enlightened in relation to him, and his holy kingdom. Without this, the high professor and the profane are on a level; the souls of both equally destitute of the knowledge of God,and in that chaotic state as to Divine creation and heavenly order, which is without form and void; without form of the Divine image, and void of Divine life, and consequently, DARKNESS covers the face of the MIGHTY DUPE. And this will remain, notwithstanding the effects of the natural man to remedy his condition; for the wisdom of *man* never wrought the *righteousness of God*, NOR NEVER CAN! for it is *earthly*, *sensual* and *devilish*, and can bring to no higher point, let its pretensions he as they may. But when the all-creative Word of Divine power speaks in the soul, ' Let there be light,'—*then it is* that the soul is supernaturally animated and enlightened; having that which forms, which fills the void, and shines into the dark understanding of the natural man, and gives him to see a *new creation* began *in his soul* by the *light* which is *Christ*, and is the life of men. Such can behold with ecstasy of joy the overshadowing of the Highest, and exclaim with Mary, ' My soul doth magnify the Lord, for he that is Mighty hath done for me great things, and holy is his name.' And with the evangelical prophet,'For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and his name shall be, Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end.' The zeal of the Lord of Host, will perform this, and not the zeal of man. For the zeal of man, the wisdom of man, and the *righteousness* of *man*, are all of the *spirit* of the world, and this *spirit* constitutes the very essence of INFIDELITY!

AN IMPARTIALIST.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

We think the phraseology of our correspondent may be misconstrued; and we, therefore, remark, we presume he intended by the declaration, ' And gives him to see a *new creation* begun in *his soul*, by the *light* which is Christ,' &c., that he, the believer, comes to the *knowledge*, by the *teaching* of *Christ*, that *he* is *in* Christ a *new creature*; and that *new* feelings of *gratitude* to Christ, for a *gift* which his *own* exertions *never* could *procure*, are *created*, or *generated* in his bosom, warms and invigorates his *heart*, and by *purifying* his affections, produces *new* views of his heavenly Father, and *love* for his *brethren* the *whole* family of man!

Scripture Illustrations.

Mr. Morier, in his account of his second journey through Persia, makes the following remarks,—" The most conspicuous building in Hamadan,is the Mesjid Jumah, a large mosque now falling into decay, and before it a *maidan*, or square, which serves as a market place. Here we observed every morning before the sun rose, that a numerous body of peasants were collected, with spades in their hands, waiting, as they informed us, to be hired by the day, to work in the surrounding fields. This custom, which I have never seen in any other part of Asia, forcibly struck us as a most happy illustration of our Saviour's parable of the labourers in the vineyard, in the 20th chapter of Matthew,---particularly when passing by the same place late in the day, we still found others standing idle, and remembered his words, " Why stand ye here all the day idle?" as most applicable to their situation; for putting the very same question to them, they answered us, " because no man hath hired us."

New Hampshire Gazette.

CONTROVERSIAL.

ANSWER TO AMATOR VERITATIS.

(Continued.)

The declaration made by our correspondent, in his *fourth* paragraph, we presume may charitably be ascribed to *ignorance*, and its concomitant, *prejudice*. If he ever recites this *falsehood*, he does it with a twinge of conscience. For he *now* knows *better*. ' A *Universal restitution*,' says our refuter, ' as before observed, is *contradicted* by *numerous* passages in the Scriptures, which assert in as *strong* terms the everlasting *misery* of the *wicked*, as they do the eternal *happiness* of the righteous; and if the *misery* of the wicked be *limited*, as some would fain think, the *felicity* of the righteous also, *must* be *so* too; for the *very same expressions*, which are the *most* forcible that could have been adopted to convey an idea of *eternal* duration, have been used to *express* the *continuation* of each of their conditions.' Now, Reader, if we cannot *prove* this statement of our correspondent to be *false* and *unfounded*, we will *give up*, and acknowledge that we know nothing about the matter. Now one thing is evident; *if* the declaration of our student be *true*, and the doctrine of the ' *Universal restitution of all things*,' *false*, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are *false* also; and the declaration of the Apostle Peter, see Acts, iii. 20, 21. of ' Jesus Christ, whom the heaven *must* receive, until the times of RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS, *which God hath spoken* by the mouth of *all* his *holy* prophets since the *world began*;' must be *false* likewise!!! Reader, what do *you* think of *this*? We appeal to your *conscience*, and let your preconceived opinions be what they may, whether you profess to believe in a *limited*, or *unlimited*, a *conditional*, or *unconditional salvation*, still we appeal to you, and ask you, as you expect to give account to God; Would *you*, on the *bed* of *death*, at the moment when you were about to enter the *unveiled presence* of your Creator and *Judge*, would you have the *hardihood* to declare with your last breath, that *God* was a LIAR, and the *mouth* of *all* his *holy prophets* the *trumpeter* of *falsehood*? No! You would not. The pride of opinion, the prejudices of education, and the *foolish rage* of party and sect, may now embolden you to ' delight in *scorning*, and to *hate* knowledge;' but that time will be *short!* It is not in the power of reason to *conceive*, or language to *define*, ' Universal restitution' in clearer and stronger terms, than the language of Scripture has done it. The apostle declares, that God hath spoken by the mouth of *all* his holy prophets, of the ' *restitution of all things*.' And David, one of God's holy prophets, testified and said,—" Among the gods *there is* none like unto thee, O Lord; neither *are there any works* like unto thy *works*. *All nations* whom thou hast made *shall come* and *worship* before thee, O Lord, and *shall glorify* thy *name*. For thou *art* great, and doest wonderous things; thou *art* God *alone*. Psalm lxxxvi. 8, 9, 10. *All* the ends of the *world shall remember* and *turn* unto the Lord; and *all* the *kindreds* of the *nations* shall worship before thee, *for* (what!) the kingdom is the *Lord's*, (not the devil's) and he *is* the Governor among the nations!" Psalm xxii. 27. We ask our young correspondent, Is this the God you worship? Does your *god* work such *works* as these? Will ' *all* nations, and the kindreds of the nations, all the ends of the world remember and turn unto *your god*, and come and *worship* before him and *glorify his* name? No! You well *know*, that the *god* whom you worship, and whom your *prototypes* and *compatriots* have *deified*, according to your account, will consign to *flames and devils*, *nine* out of *ten* of the miserable wretches, whom you pretend he *made* for that *very purpose!* Are *you* not *ashamed* for your *god*, when you see him *dwindle* into *insignificance*, and look *black* with *malignity*, on the slightest *comparison* with the God of the *whole earth*, the Universal Father, Friend, Benefactor, and the Saviour of the *world*? If not, you have no shame in you. The God and Saviour whom *we worship*, will *blast* with the effulgence of the smallest ray of *his* glory, the malignant demon, whom the dignified imaginations of proud Pharisees and infuriated Zealots have *generated* in their *piously* bewildered imaginations! In fine,—The DEVIL we *despise* and *resist*, is less *malignant*, than the god you pretend to *worship* and *adore!* The great and glorious Being *we* worship, *spoke by the mouth* of his holy prophet Isaiah, and said, ' I have *sworn by myself*, the word is gone out of my mouth, *righteousness*, *and shall not return*, That *unto me* EVERY knee shall *bow*, EVERY *tongue shall swear*; SURELY *shall* say, *in* the *Lord* have I *righteousness* and strength; to HIM shall come, and ALL that are INCENSED against him SHALL BE ASHAMED!' Now, we ask our ' young,' but bold *refuter*, who has ' no fear to undertake to prove' *Jehovah* and all his *holy prophets* LIARS, whether this *contradicts* the testimony relative to the doctrine of the restitution of all things? If so, please to *tell how*? We demand of you, to answer the following questions,—*first*, whether *every* knee will not include *all* the race of Adam, *every man*? *Second*, whether you believe that *every tongue* shall confess the TRUTH, when EVERY TONGUE *confesses*, that they have RIGHTEOUSNESS IN God? *Third*. Whether *your* HELL will be full of sinners, devils, and fire and brimstone, when *every one shall come to God*? *Fourth*. Whether ' *sinners will be mere devils*, and be BLASPHEMING and CURSING God,' when they BOW the KNEE,and confess ' In the Lord have I RIGHTEOUSNESS?' *Fifth*. Whether you believe,when JEHOVAH SWEARS BY HIMSELF, that he *means* what he *says*? And if so, will not *you*, then, be *ashamed* of having undertaken to *prove* your Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, a LIAR!!! We think you will.

Our correspondent, likewise in his fourth paragraph, declares of the Scriptures, that they ' Assert in as *strong* terms the *misery* of the *wicked*, as they do the *eternal* happiness of the *righteous*; and if the *misery* of the wicked is *limited*, as *some* would *fain* think, the *felicity* of the righteous also, *must* be *so* too, for the very *same expressions* which are the *most forcible* that could have been adopted to convey an idea of *eternal duration*. have been *used* to express the continuation of *both* of their conditions,' Now we *deny* this without any ceremony! But we shall not trust *our* conclusions to the *mercy* of the reader, without any premises to support them. This might do for an inexperienced advocate of *error*, but would not answer for those who contend for the *truth*. Our correspondent immediately introduced in his *fifth* paragraph, what we presume he intended for *proof*, that the ' same expressions are used,' &c. In the passage here quoted, we cheerfully acknowledge, because we acknowledge the truth, that if we had no other evidence of *eternal*, or never-ending existence in a *future state*, but what we could draw from the word *αιωνιον*, uniformly used in the passages alluded to, we should have no *expectation whatever*. No! None! And why? *Ans.* Because the connexion would not justify an expectation, founded on this word; neither does the word mean any thing more than *age*, if used in the *singular*, or *ages*, if used in the *plural!* It is in vain for our opponents to attempt to disprove this. The day for *looking* the *truth* out of *countenance*, and the *diploma* of ' divine doctor' giving currency and enforcing obedience on pain of eternal damnation to contradiction and absurdity, *that* day is gone by. We estimate the *charitable*

anathemas of our pious *would-be soul-keepers* within *one mill* of their real value, and *that* we presume, is too well known to our readers to make it necessary to mention it. We request our correspondent to take his Bible, and divesting himself as much as possible of his prejudices, to examine carefully *our data*, and prove by *positive* facts, any errors in our doctrine from the Scripture, and we will thank him; and if he finds on mature examination, that he is wrong (and the god of this world does not blind him,) let him come like an honest man before the world, and confess the error of those sentiments he has ushered before the bar of the public. Now we are determined *not* to believe that *white* is *black*. And it would, we think, be as *easy* to convince us that *white* is *black*, as to convince us of the *truth* of our correspondent's shadowy premises. If the Scriptures mean any thing, they *mean* what they *say;* and it is the height of folly and absurdity to try to *pull* and *twist* them to any other meaning. We again request our correspondent to give a candid hearing to the evidence we are going to produce, not from modern doctors of divinity, but from the Scriptures of the inspiration of God. And first, we shall take this 25th chap. of Matthew, at least that part of it which is introduced by our correspondent, &c. "Depart from me ye *cursed*," &c. When is this to take place? Do you believe Christ is *coming* (in the future tense,) to *send* a considerable part of the human race to endless misery? If so, you *deny* in plain terms the testimony of the Scriptures. The apostle Peter declared *after* the *ascension* of Christ, that the 'heaven *must* receive (retain) him, until the times of the restitution of all things,' &c. Will Christ come to judgment *after* all things are *restored*, and send *restored* men to *hell*? Again, Christ himself, as recorded by John, xii. 46 to 50 inclusive, explains the *future* state of all men at the *last* day, and his *judgment*, if he is to be believed, will be LIFE EVERLASTING! Not death, nor damnation. We request our correspondent to recollect, that the division of the Scriptures into *chapter* and *verse*, is a modern invention; consequently, these divisions have nothing to do with the subjects, or the doctrine contained in the chapters. The *subject* treated of in the 25th chapter of Matthew, is *commenced* in the 23d chap. 36th verse of which declares, 'Verily I say unto you, *All these things shall come upon this generation.*' The subject is continued to the 24th chap. and even the translators were convinced that he there spoke of the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and the temple, &c. The 30th verse declares, "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, *and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven* with power and great glory." And the 34th verse declares, "Verily I say unto you, *This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled.*" The remainder of the chapter is a continuation of the same subject; and the 44th verse declares, 'In such an hour as *ye think not* the Son of man *cometh.*' The 25th chap. commences, by saying, "THEN, (When? *Ans.* At the time spoken of in the 24th chap.) Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto *ten virgins*, &c., *five* of whom are *wise* and *five* are *foolish.*" Please to notice,—it does not say, the kingdom of *heaven* is like five *wise* virgins, and the kingdom of *hell* is like five *foolish* virgins! No! It is the kingdom of *heaven* which is spoken of. See Acts xi. 5, 6, to 9th verses. The 18th verse of this 25th chap. 44 of the xxiv. and 36 of the xxiii. are proofs, that the same subject, namely, 'the coming of the Son of man,' &c., is continued. The 31st verse of the 25th chap. says, 'When the Son of man shall come in his glory,' &c. *Then* shall *happen* what our correspondent is pleased to consider the day of the consummation of all things; and that *then* a great number of the *human race* will be *consigned to endless torments!* Now we declare, that the Son of man *came* (in the past tense,) in the *generation*, to whom these words were addressed; and as proof, we give the testimony of Christ himself. He declared, see 24th chap. 30th and 31st verses, that he *should come*, &c.; and further, that the *generation* to whom he addressed himself, should *not pass away until all things be fulfilled.* And in the 35th chap. 31st verse, he declared, '*When* the *Son* of man *shall come*,' then shall happen, &c., *this* which he previously spoke of. And to add emphasis to his words, he declared, 'Heaven and earth *shall* pass *away*, but *my words* shall *not pass away!!!*' Let our REFUTER look at *these* testimonies, and remember, that it is "*Christ* who *argues*, by *his* testimony, and not a *feeble creature.*"

It is evident, therefore, that the *expressions* used by our Saviour, as recorded by Matthew, were only intended to convey an idea of a *limited* duration; and they were by Christ *confined* to the *age* or *generation* of those to whom he addressed himself. We shall presume to take it for granted, until our correspondent *proves* to the contrary, that the *kingdom* spoken of, was the *gospel;* and the declaration, 'but the *righteous* into life αιωνιον, means nothing more, nor less, than this, that the *believers* in the *gospel*, or *salvation* of God, should, during their *age*, or *generation*, or *natural life*, experience the *joys* which arise from the *knowledge* of the *gospel* or *kingdom;* and which falls far *short* of the *joys* yet to be *revealed.* Paul preached this doctrine, see Romans, 8th chap. 23d verse. "And not only *they*, but ourselves also, which have the *first fruits* (αιωνιον) of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body." See 1 Cor. xiii. 13. "And now abideth faith, hope, charity; but the greatest of these is *charity.*" The *faith*, and *hope*, will be swallowed up in *certainty;* but *charity* alone will remain! This *faith*, and *hope*, is the *effect*,—the *cause*, is God, who gives the knowledge. *Faith* and *hope* remains, or *lasts* during the *age* of the *believer*, who enjoys the glorious anticipation of the '*restitution of all things*,' when his body shall be *redeemed* at the resurrection, when all shall rise in the Redeemer's image; for 'as we have borne the image of the *earthy*, we shall also bear the *image* of the *heavenly.* Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, &c.; for this corruptible *must* put on incorruption," &c. 1 Cor. xv. 49 to 53. This will appear yet more plain, if we consider, first, that it was during the *age* spoken of by Christ, that he was *offered* up, "and by *one* offering, perfected for ever those that are sanctified." Now we have no objection to restrict the term in Hebrews, to mean *age*,* for Paul, who wrote that Epistle, declared to the Galatians, 2d chap. 20th verse, "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live, yet *not I*, but Christ liveth in me,—and the *life* which I *now* live in the flesh, I *live* by the *faith* of the *Son of God*, who loved *me*, and gave himself for me." This conveys an useful lesson. Paul was *loved*, not because he repented, for he was redeemed, and after Christ loved and died for him, he persecuted the saints. We now ask our correspondent, whether the *strong expressions* he quoted relative to the punishment of the wicked, in Matthew 25, are as strong as the declarations of the apostle, see Romans viii. 38, 39. "For I am persuaded," (Paul really spoke as though he was quite positive. Was he mistaken? On this question our correspondent *stands* or falls!) "I," says Paul, "am persuaded, that neither DEATH, nor LIFE, nor ANGELS, nor PRINCIPALITIES, nor POWERS, nor things present, nor THINGS to COME, &c., shall be ABLE to SEPARATE *us* from the LOVE of GOD, which is IN CHRIST JESUS our LORD!" Now *who* does *God* love? The Scriptures shall answer,—"God so LOVED THE WORLD, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Now for the objection. He that believeth! Granted, and no other,—and more, the life here mentioned, is the αιωνιον life; and it is the consequence of faith. Look again to Galatians ii. 20. This life which is the consequence of faith, when faith is made shipwreck is lost,—mark well the phraseology, HE that BELIEVETH,—when he ceases to believe, he perishes! But remember, this αιωνιον, LIFE, and the LOVE of GOD, are *two* things! But do not some perish? Yes, many,—but hear the word of God,—"Thy DEAD SHALL LIVE! *My* DEAD BODY shall *they* arise; ('Be it known unto you, that Christ is the HEAD of every man; we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.') AWAKE and sing, ye that dwell in dust," &c. This is confirmation strong,—here competition ceases,—armed with the SWORD of the GOSPEL of Christ, the Omnipotent word of God, we fear no enemy,—we are ready to meet a world in arms,—for battle is but a prelude to conquest, because we fight under the *banners* of *God*, who *giveth* us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord; to whom be ALL the glory through all ages, and to world without end! Amen.

(*To be Concluded next week.*)

* When we wrote the above, we supposed, Hebrews x. 14. "He hath perfected *for ever* them that are sanctified. read in the original το αιωνιος, but upon examination, we find it is ες το διηνεκες; "*Perpetuus* 1. *Perpetual, uninterrupted, continual, without ceasing.* 2. *Universal, always holding good.* 3. *Constant. permanent.* 4 *The whole. all.* 5. *Everlasting, endless, immortal.* &c. We give this explanation for the truth's sake. We have no fears of our correspondent's taking advantage of the liberty we gave him. We consider this as CONCLUSIVE! See Rev. xiv. 11. It is there, from *age* to *age* When time shall be no more, *ages* shall cease! We repeat it,—this evidence is *conclusive!*

For the Gospel Herald.

Questions relating to the Unpardonable Sin.

First. Can we ever in time or eternity, say with propriety, that we have been forgiven a sin, which was atoned for by the sufferings of Christ, in union with the members of his body?

Second. Is it necessary the debtor should both *pay* the debt, and be *forgiven* too, in order to go free?

Third. When Christ took away the sin of the world, by his sufferings unto death, was that sin, (the sin unto death,) forgiven, or atoned for? or was it both?

Fourth. Did not all men suffer with Christ on the cross nearly 1800 years ago? Why suffer, if the sin was forgiven? That all pardonable sins were then forgiven in Christ, I will not deny,—pain only was felt for that, which could *not* be forgiven.

MYSTICUS.

REMARKS.

We are disposed to say, that all sins are pardonable; if not, the prophet surely was wrong, when he said, of God, 'who forgiveth *all* thine *iniquities*,' &c.

Quere. Cannot a good father forgive with all his heart, the trespass of his child, and at the same time let the child suffer a temporary inconvenience from that trespass, and the father's motive be for the good of his child? This simple question properly understood, would, we think, teach many an useful lesson.

IMPORTANT QUERIES.

Those who constantly insist that it is necessary to hold up the doctrine of a future state of punishment in order to deter the wicked from the commission of sin, and that the opinion that all the punishment for sin is in this world, where it is committed, is of immoral tendency, are asked the following questions.

Would a thief ever steal, if he knew beforehand that he should certainly be detected and punished according to law? If this question be answered in the negative, as we are sure every man will answer it, it is then evident, that the punishment our law inflicts would be quite sufficient to deter the thief, provided there could be no hope of escape. Now the case is clear; we want something that may operate to make up the deficiency occasioned by a possibility of escape. Well, is the doctrine of this future punishment sufficient to make up this defect? If this question be answered in the negative, as we are sure it must be, then what good does it do? We know that all sorts of crimes are constantly practised by those who have been educated from infancy to believe in this future hell, and who never doubted of the reality of the doctrine. Then the question remains, what good has their education, in this particular ever effected? We believe that the best method is to teach men that there is no possible way of escape from the evil consequences of wrong doing, but to "cease to do evil and to learn to do well."

Boston Universalist Magazine.

*** Correspondents who have usually sent their communications to the residence of the Editor, are informed, he has removed to 53 Elm-Street.

Mentor, Theophilus, and Witness are received.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1820. NO. 29.

COMMUNICATIONS.

I have frequently thought, that if we had no other criterion by which to detect the errors of those doctrines which are esteemed orthodox, a careful examination of the contradictions which appear when contrasting the writings and preachings of different clergymen, who are estimated correct, as well as of the inconsistency of each with himself; these would alone furnish sufficient materials for our purpose. The fondness which is so often displayed for the systems of man's invention,—the pride of learning, and frequently a desire to show the talent of rounding a period gracefully, without a thought beyond the gratification of the ear by a rhetorical flourish, repeatedly leads men to the utterance of principles, which they would not for a moment vindicate in an argument, nor suffer others to use without a reprimand. We are all liable to err; and it is not becoming in us to make a man an offender for a word; but it is well for us to examine carefully every production relating to the great concern of a future state, and especially, when it comes from a source to which thousands look, as to an oracle of divinity, an *almost infallible* teacher.

I have made the foregoing remarks, as an introduction to a quotation from a very learned and very eloquent preacher, late a president of Yale College, and author of a *system of divinity*. The extract contains a complete paragraph, and may be taken as a *whole*, not being any where in the sermon spoken of as containing a false principle. That a preacher so much esteemed should declare, and *thrice repeat* what every intelligent man must pronounce *Atheistical*, is indeed *strange*, but such is the *fact*. The extract is copied verbatim from a sermon delivered on the decease of Mr. Marsh, a member, and probably a professor in that institution. Of this, however, I am not certain; having extracted the quotation from the sermon more than five years ago. The sermon is dated, Nov. 20, 1803, and can easily be procured if necessary. Here follows the extract.—

"Among the things which are taught by the dead, those are especially interesting, which have heretofore respected themselves,—those in which they have been personally concerned,—in which they acted or suffered; for which they have been distinguished, and by which they have been characterized. Thus the *infant*, in artless and melancholy accents, lisps from the grave the most affecting lessons, on the uncertainty, shortness, and vanity of life. Not even the comparative *innocence* of that early period, it declares, furnishes the least exemption from pain and sorrow, disease and death. "See here," *it cries* from the dreary tomb, "the dawn of existence, *set and vanished in never-ending night.* Behold me, *born only to die;* and carried from the cradle to the grave. In mé see LIFE, and HOPE, and JOY, lighted up, *only* to be *extinguished*,—a day-star risen, *but followed by no* FUTURE DAY."

To every man professing to believe in the immortality of the soul, the question is now stated; whether he is ready to place implicit confidence in the witness of any system-monger, who can utter so great an absurdity in so few words! For the honour of humanity, it is to be hoped, that every man who knows even but little of the import of language, will pause, before he gives credence to the crude systems of men, who treat the understanding of their hearers and readers with so much contempt, as to offer them such *husks* as the foregoing paragraph presents. And yet, it is a melancholy fact, that in our nearest, our best, and beyond all comparison our greatest interests, we too often receive for truth the *ipse dixit* of fallible men, and with less caution, than we should observe in a pecuniary matter of the value of one *dollar*.

Is this speaking unguardedly, or is the language in its fullest extent warranted by the most conclusive facts? It is a demonstrable truth, witnessed by nearly every day's observation. Ask him, who has for years attended the preaching, and holden communion with the most *orthodox* of the age, the simplest questions relating to the Scriptures, or to his *confession of faith?* And the reply will generally be as consistent with truth, as the answer of a blind man to an interrogatory respecting the colours of distant objects!

Reader,—do you doubt my statement? If you do, make the experiment, and let the issue satisfy you. Inquire, where, and when, the image of God was *lost?* and then insist upon a *Scripture definition* of the image of God. Inquire, where we read of an *eternal death?* and then add unto it the last verse of the sixth of Romans, and try the principle as opposed to *eternal life!*

But why particularize a few of the inventions of men used as props to a *Babel* of the most heterogeneous construction? The whole fabric is based on the *impudence*, or the *ignorance* of its supporters! The abominable idea of never-ending misery, as a consequence of finite crime,—and that it is to be inflicted by him, whose essence is Love, is beyond all comparison the greatest absurdity which has ever disgraced the annals of our world.

MENTOR.

Albany, October 15, 1820.

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR,—I feel myself under some obligation to you, for noticing the inquiries that I made concerning the genealogy of our Saviour as given in Matthew and Luke. But I should have been better pleased, had you given me an answer of your own, instead of that of Adam Clarke; which I must frankly confess, I consider as no answer at all. Mr. C. was indeed a learned man, but to use a vulgar expression, he had some very weak spots. I have no doubt but he thought his explanation fully satisfactory. So when he gravely tells us, that the serpent which deceived Eve, was the ourang outang; and also, that Dr. Lightfoot's devil caught up Judas as a hawk catches up a chicken, and flying high in the air, let him fall and dash to pieces; I do not feel any disposition even in these cases to call his sincerity in question. But it is absolutely impossible for me to believe such things. From such explanations I can receive no satisfaction or instruction. But I did flatter myself, that you, or some of your correspondents or readers, would cast some light upon this intricate, but important subject. I must therefore once more call upon you, or some of your readers, to give me the much desired information.

POTHOS.

ANSWER.

We know of no *data* which would probably satisfy Pothos. Did the truths of the Christian religion depend on reconciling this discrepancy, it would then assume the shape of an important inquiry. This, however, is very far from being the case. In Jesus Christ were fulfilled the predictions of the prophets, who testified that he should come. And the *evidence* he gave, by *rising* triumphant from the *tomb*, should be sufficient, without this *required* evidence; for had we no *other* evidence of *Jesus* being the *Christ*, but the *agreement* of Matthew and Luke in *their* genealogical accounts of his earthly progenitors, we should not believe him to be the Christ, the Saviour of the world. Therefore, although it would be a satisfaction to see this long disputed question settled to the consent of all parties, still it would, we think, if settled, afford at least, but *trifling* testimony, *compared* with the *great cloud of witnesses which now beset us.* We conclude, with the advice of the Apostle Paul, "Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying, *which is in faith.*"

Note. Any communication on this subject, from any of our correspondents, or others, which can in any shape afford satisfaction to Pothos, we shall publish with *pleasure.*

CONTROVERSIAL.

MR. EDITOR,—In Number 23 of the Gospel Herald, you ask, "Is it not an outrage upon every principle of common sense, to deny the pre-existence of the soul?" And then you answer, "It is." Now, Sir, to be frank, I am in great danger of committing this outrage; and unless you can produce much stronger arguments in support of this opinion than I ever yet have seen, I shall most assuredly be guilty of it.

I wish you to bear in mind, that I have no intention at present of meddling with the main points in dispute between you and your opponents, but shall confine myself to the subject above-mentioned. It has been asserted by some, and I suppose in agreement with your opinion, that, because the works of creation were finished in six days, God within that time created souls enough for all the bodies that should ever come into existence on this earth; and indeed upon the same principle, upon all other earths in the universe. But many difficulties seem to arise from this hypothesis. As, where have all the millions and millions of souls, not yet furnished with bodies, taken up their residence while they have been waiting, and no doubt anxiously waiting for these frail tenements of clay. Do they enjoy complete and conscious existence,—if so, why do we not have some recollection of that pre-existent state?—if not, is there not something very whimsical in the idea, that they should be left in that half finished situation for so many thousand years? As all souls must have been cotemporaries with the souls of Adam and Eve, and of course, totally independent of him for their existence, how could they be tainted or rendered impure, or indeed, in any way be affected by the fall of Adam, which took place on this earth? If our souls have been created as long as the world, we might reasonably expect that they would have arrived at a very great degree of wisdom and knowledge, before they came into this world, for these are the properties of the soul, and not of the body. Do you suppose that children are born into the world at the present day, possessing more wisdom than those which were born four or five thousand years ago? Or do you suppose they have wasted away thousands of years in complete idleness? This would, indeed, enable you to tell why most people are too indolent, ever to arrive at any great degree of perfection in any art or science, for we all know that it is hard to conquer old habits. I could ask you many more questions, but I do not like to trouble you with too many at once.

Your Friend,
TIMOTHEUS.

ANSWER.

It is our opinion, that Timotheus will find greater difficulty in *denying*, than in *admitting* our premises; and for one plain reason,—namely, *our* premises are necessary to support his *own* conclusions. It is a common remark, that the existence of a Deity, or first great cause, is of *necessity* true. And the reasonableness of this remark, proceeds alone from the acknowledged fact, that *effect*, of necessity, presupposes a *cause*. Before Timotheus commits the *outrage* which he says he is in 'great danger' of committing, we request him to ask himself *three* questions. *First.* How could men die, *before* they lived?

Second. How could they *live*, without having *existence? Third.* How could they exist *in Adam*, without existing *prior* to their present mode of existence?

If Timotheus does not *commit* the outrage, until he answers the above questions to the satisfaction of any reasonable man, we think he will *never commit it*.

Timotheus says, "This would indeed *enable* you to tell why most people are too indolent ever to arrive at any great degree of perfection in any *art*, or *science*; for we all know it is hard to conquer old habits." Though we are not acquainted with particulars, still we think, we can *tell* the *cause* why, &c. The *cause* is either *physical*, or *mental*; and *direct*, or *indirect*. For instance, blindness. If a man is *born blind*, it physically incapacitates him from acquiring knowledge in many *arts* and *sciences*. If a man is born with a mal-conformation of parts, proper to *reason*, he is, as respects his present mode of existence, an *idiot*. Physical causes may be *indirect*. A concurrence of circumstances apparently fortuitous, may seclude in the obscure cottage, and howling wilderness, a being, who under more benign and favourable circumstances, would explore the fields of science, *unlock* the mysteries of nature, and shine the Newton of his age. Mental causes may be *indirect*. The mind by early and wrong impressions, may wander from the path of wisdom, and pursuing wrong objects, be prevented by *satiety*, or *disgust*, from future exertions. We think, however, it might be a question of the *arts and sciences* among men, whether they are a *bane*, or *antidote*, in part, at least. The *art* of making one another *miserable*, and the *science* of confounding *truth* and *error*, in such a manner as to make it a disputable point, even among celebrated Doctors of Divinity, whether ENDLESS MISERY, OR ENDLESS HAPPINESS is *best*, is, in *our* opinion at least, a *sorry* argument in their *favour*. The only true criterion to judge of the *merits* of any art, or science, is its *utility*. And if this infallible rule were in every case extensively and impartially applied, we hazard the declaration, that few men could be found who value their reputations, who would publicly and indiscriminately advocate them! The ART of making each other *happy*, and the *science* of *enlightening* the understanding in the things which *alone* belong to our *peace*, is, in our humble opinion, of more value than all others put together! Consequently, all arts and sciences which militate against the happiness of mankind, are a *curse* instead of a *blessing*. The Scriptures inform us, that "man was made upright, but sought out many inventions." The arts and sciences, therefore, which are the inventions of depraved understandings, cannot justly be considered as belonging to *upright* beings; and our correspondent may easily find a solution to his difficulty, from this fact; for the inventions *posterior* to the *fall*, were unknown previous to that time, and men by dying to their upright state, lost their knowledge of that state. It, therefore, follows, that a child born four thousand years ago, would know as much of the arts and sciences abroad in the world, as a child born in our age, &c.; and that would be nothing at all.

It must occur to Timotheus, that the arts and sciences generally, are confined to, and grow out of the real, or imaginary wants and passions, which are indigenous to this mode of existence. It is a question of little consequence, whether a *cockle-shell* found in Asia, is of the same *genus* with those found in Europe; or whether *butterflies* in England, have *longer legs* than those found in America; yet questions of similar and trifling moment occupy the attention, employ the time, and create expenses, while thousands of our species are miserably ignorant of their destination, and unhappy here, from fear and uncertainty relative to their future state. There is one fact which speaks volumes,—of the *arts and sciences*, which in the civilized world make so great a noise, and occupy so much attention, there are not probably more than *one* to a *thousand*, of all the *human race*, who know the meaning of the terms which designate, or define them; and the real difference existing here, between the greatest philosopher, and the most stupid idiot, is incomparably less, than the difference between the philosopher here, and the idiot disencumbered of his mortal shackles, and received into the full blaze of a glorious, triumphant, and happy ETERNITY!

ANSWER TO AMATOR VERITATIS.

(Concluded.)

"*Because thy rage is come up against me, and thy tumult is come up into mine ears, therefore, will I put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest.* ISAIAH, XXXVII, 29.

Our REFUTER closed his *fifth* paragraph, as follows,—"O reader be not deluded; for there is *no salvation* for those who *die impenitent*; the *word of God asserts*, that the smoke of *their* torments ascendeth up for ever and ever: and *they* shall have no rest *day* nor *night*." At the close of his communication, he quotes the passage in Rev. 22d chap. 18th verse, "If any man *shall ADD unto these things*, God shall *add unto him* the plagues that are written in this book," &c., and declares, 'HE considers it as applicable to the *whole of the Bible!*' And this is prefaced, by exclaiming, "O YE DECEIVERS, there is an AWFUL wo denounced against you," &c. Therefore, "out of thine *own mouth* will I judge thee!" How dared you *add* to the things 'written in the book,' by declaring, that "there is no salvation for those who die impenitent;" and that "the word of God asserts, that the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever," &c. We tell you solemnly and plainly, that you have by perversion, contradicted the testimony of heaven! Will not the *wo* you denounced, and the plagues, be added to *you*? Again,—You commenced your *sixth* paragraph, by declaring, "There is not the least hope for a *future restoration* to be derived from the Scriptures," &c. God declared by his prophet (Ezekiel, xvi. 40 to the end) to the Jews, that they should "be stoned with stones, and thrust through with swords," (would they not die?) "Nevertheless, I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant," &c. Even the restoration of Sodom is declared. In the 37th chap. see 11th to 14th verses, inclusive, the *future restoration* of all the Jews is declared. "Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost; we are cut off for our parts. Therefore, prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I *am* the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live; and I shall place you in your own land; then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken *it*, and performed *it*, saith the Lord." In Psalm xxii. 27. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." (Quere. Is not this 'future restoration?') The apostle Peter declared, see Acts 3d chap. 21st verse, of our ascended Lord, "whom the heaven must receive, until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Will not this be a future restitution? Paul declared, see 1 Cor. xv. 22, 52, 53. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound,—and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must (not may) put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality!" And the prophet declares, "all flesh shall see the salvation of God!"* Let our refuter now lay his hand upon his breast, and in the presence of his God and Judge, declare, that he has not taken away any thing from the words of the prophecy of this book, (Bible) IF HE DARES!! Reader, look at this blasphemous and impious declaration of this orthodox candidate for the ministry,—look at it, lay your hand upon your breast, and in the presence of your God and Judge, pronounce it truth at your peril! Here it is,—"There is not the least hope for a future restoration to be derived from the Scriptures." And you, ye licensed promulgators of this heresy, hear ye the word of the Lord,—"Wo be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord. Therefore saith the Lord God of Israel against the Pastors that feed my people, Ye have scattered my flock, and driven them away, and have not visited them; behold, I will visit upon you the evil of your doings, saith the Lord. And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and increase. And I will set up shepherds over them, which shall feed them; and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord. (Jeremiah xxiii. 1st to 4th verses inclusive.) "My people hath been lost sheep: their shepherds have caused them to go astray; they have turned them away on the mountains, &c. All that found them have devoured them; and their adversaries said, We offend not, because *they have sinned* against the Lord," &c. Jer. l. 6, 7. Ezek. xxxiv. 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 23. "Therefore, O ye shepherds, hear the word of the Lord; Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I am against the shepherds; and I will require my flock at their hand, and cause them to cease from feeding the flock; neither shall the shepherds feed themselves any more: for I will deliver my flock from their mouth, that they may not be meat for them. For thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I, even I, will both search my sheep, and seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is amongst his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day. I will feed my flock, and I will cause them to lie down, saith the Lord God. I will seek that which was lost, and bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick: but I will destroy the fat and the strong; I will feed them with judgment. And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd."

Our correspondent in his sixth paragraph, says, "Christ assures us, that the fire of hell shall never be quenched," &c., and refers us to Mark, 9th chap. 43d to 48th verses inclusive. The word in the original, translated *hell*, is γεένναν. locus suppliciorum, *locus*, a *place*, *suppliciorum*, a *supplication*, a *prayer*, &c., *public punishment*. In 1 Cor. xv. 55. O grave, in the original, ἅδης, orcus mors,—*orcus*, the *state*, or *space* of the dead,—*mors* death. In Rev. xx. 13, 14. *hell* in the original, is ἅδης. Now, we are not only willing, but we cheerfully confess, that the fire of gehenna shall not (or if you like it better, shall never) be quenched. What is gehenna? It is translated hell,—granted, so is hades. In Hebrew, it is the vallis Hinnomi. It was in this valley of Hinnom, that the idolatrous Israelites sacrificed to their idols. Christ says, "Seek first the kingdom of heaven," &c. And in the passage in question, Christ says, it is better to enter into life maimed, than, &c., to be cast into gehenna, or hell. Life, light, and immortality, are brought to light, (or made known) by the gospel. The contrast to this gospel, is death, darkness, and mortality, or *gehenna*, hell. The intelligent reader, who is not blinded by his prejudices, will see, that gehenna is the *state* of spiritual death, in which unbelievers are cast. And *hades* is the *place* of mortal death; the receptacle of the dead. We shall prove this. Likewise, the fire of *gehenna* spoken of, of what nature it is, &c. It is, however, proper to observe, that the language in Mark is highly figurative. If any one disputes this, we ask, do you believe it is to be taken literally? If so, pluck out your eye, and cut off your hand! your own mouth shall judge you, and hell on your principle, will inevitably be your portion! If you from necessity admit a *part* to be figurative, give a reason why the whole is not figurative; or, at least, show your authority for making one part figurative instead of another! This you can never do!

* See Isaiah 1. 21 to 27. xlix. 6, to 17. Jeremiah. xxx. 10 to 17. Galatians. iii 28, 29. Ephesians. ii. 13, to 20. John x. 1 to 6, & 16th verse. Psalm c. 3. Isaiah xxv. 6, 7, 8. Rev. v. 13. Psalm lxxxvi. 9. John iv. 24.

Paul in his First Epistle to Cor. xv. 54, 55, says, "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then *shall be brought to pass* the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in VICTORY. O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, (*hades*) where is thy victory?" Reader, will you at that time answer, and say, the *sting* of death, and *the victory* of the grave, is in *gehenna*? If so, and if you answer *truly*, How can the saying that is written *be brought to pass*? Let him *answer* this question that *can*. And our word for *it*, The saying that is written will be brought to *pass*, *before* this question will be answered!!! If but *one* of the race of Adam is at that time under the dominion of, or a *victim* to *death*, temporal, or spiritual, *he* can give the LIE DIRECT to the *triumphant song*, and *cry*, HERE is the STING of DEATH! HERE is the VICTIM of the GRAVE!!!

The *fire* of *gehenna* never will be *quenched*. But *gehenna itself* shall be swallowed up in *light*, and *life*, and *love*. The full blaze of the Redeemer's righteousness shall burst upon the universe, enlightening the minds, purifying the affections, and warming with the glow of devotion the hearts of all; and the declaration of the prophet, "O death, I will be thy plagues! O *scheol* (hell) I will be thy *destruction*," shall be manifest to congregated worlds; and *one eternal day*, O GOD, BE THINE!!! In the absence of the natural sun, it must be *dark*, as a consequence. In the absence of the Spiritual Sun of Righteousness, Jesus Christ, the *mind* of man is *dark*, and his *state* is *gehenna*. In this *state* he experiences the *fire* spoken of; and to him it *never* will be *quenched*. It is the concomitant of unbelief; and the unbeliever must experience it, as long as he is an unbeliever. But the moment he *believes*, that moment he is *out* of *gehenna*; and free from its *fires*. Its flames can no longer *scorch* him, for he is covered from head to foot with the *armour* of the gospel of *peace!* The apostle James, in his Epistle, chap. iii. says, "For in many things *we* (not the *non-elect*, or wicked sinners,) offend all. If any man *offend* not in *word*, the same *is* a perfect man, able also to bridle the whole body. The tongue *is* a little member, and boasteth great things. Behold, how great a matter a little *fire* kindleth! And the *tongue is a* FIRE, a world of iniquity; so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on *fire* the course of nature; and *it is set on* FIRE of HELL!" Reader, the word here translated *hell*, is γεέννης. If this testimony is not conclusive, there is *no* meaning in language!

If our *refuter* is not *convinced* by this irrefutable testimony, he has no hold to retreat to, but the darkness of his own mind, '*gehenna*!' But he shall be brought from this recess of *fire* and *flames*; for *Jehovah* has declared, "I will *ransom* them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction; repentance shall be hid (I will not turn from this my purpose, or, the very idea of changing this my purpose, shall be hid from me,—*I will not think of it*,) repentance shall be hid from my eyes!" Hosea xiii. 14.

Our refuter, in his sixth paragraph, says, "None of the unregenerate sons of Adam shall ever walk the golden streets," &c. *This is truth!* But God be praised, we have his word, that "All the ends of the world shall *remember* and *turn* unto the Lord." Then, 'they shall walk the golden streets!' Our refuter adds, "For he that cannot lie, has said, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the *kingdom* of *heaven*." We JOYFULLY say, Amen! This is triumphant testimony! Heaven be praised for this!!! Now unbeliever, *Where art thou*? The same God, 'that *cannot lie*,' has declared, they, "All the ends of the world shall *remember and turn*, all nations whom God hath made *shall come* and worship!" Nay, more,—the same God, 'who cannot lie,' has declared, "him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out!" Will not they who come be *converted*? Will they not be *in* the kingdom of heaven, when they worship? And will not they then worship in *spirit*, and in truth? For such, says Christ, "The Father chooses to worship him!"

Our refuter adds, "Can any one be so vain, as to say, that this *change* can take place *after death*? A supposition like this cannot be supported," &c. Now, we are so *vain*, as not barely to suppose this, but to *believe* it. All God's prophets believed it. Isaiah, see xxvi. 19. declares, "Thy *dead* shall *live*, my dead body shall they arise." Again, see xxviii. 18. "And your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell (*gehenna*) shall not stand." See Ezekiel xxxvii. 3. "Can these bones live? (What say *you*, Amator Veritatis? Ezekiel said) O Lord, thou knowest. 5. Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones, Behold, I will cause breath to enter into you, and *ye shall live*. (Dare *you* call this *vantty*?) 14. And shall put my Spirit in you, and *ye shall live*." Quere. Were these, 'the *whole* house of Israel' deprived of the Spirit of God? Our refuter adds, "The *Scriptures* as well as reason attests the contrary. We learn from them, (the Scriptures) that those who come to this awful end will be so far from becoming reconciled to God, that they will become *mere devils*, who will *spend an eternity* in cursing and blaspheming their Maker's name," &c. We are sorry to be again obliged to charge our *refuter* with downright *falsehood*; but so it is. Why did not he produce his testimony to prove this? Now we tell him, the Scriptures no where say, that any of the race of Adam "will become *mere devils*, and spend an eternity in cursing," &c. How dare you *add* to the book? Are not you afraid of the "awful wo denounced, and of the plagues?" 'This truth,' you say, "no one will *deny*, who believes the words of our Lord, for he has said, in that furnace of fire, there shall be *wailing* and *gnashing of teeth*, Matthew xiii. 50." Is *wailing* and *gnashing* of teeth, *cursing* and *blaspheming*? And does Christ say, they shall *curse* and *blaspheme* their Maker's name to all eternity? Answer this, thou "child of the devil, and full of all subtilty?" If you will look at the 38th verse of this chapter, you will learn, that the "*good seed* are the children of the kingdom;" and by looking at the 8th chap. 12th verse, you will learn, that the "children of the kingdom shall be cast into utter darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." What do you think of this? What will you do now?

Our refuter's *seventh* paragraph relates to Judas. We refer him to our 22d Number, page 92, and 23d Number, 93d and 94th pages, for a full and conclusive answer to his objection.

His *eighth* paragraph is a compound of *misconstruction* and *folly*, almost without a precedent. And we pass it by with observing, that we have *truth* for his *falsehoods*, and *pity* for his *ignorance*.

His last paragraph contains a quotation from Hebrews x. 26, 27. We inform him, that in the original, the word which is translated adversaries, is ναεναντιως. contrarius. contrario. Or that which is *contrary to*, *repugnant*, *hurtful*, &c. Adversarius, an *enemy* (in the singular) an *adversary*. See Luke xiii. 17. 'All his adversaries (plural) were ashamed.' In the original, αντικειμενοι. In Hebrews, the person spoken of, looks for indignation, but instead of destroying *him*, the creature of God, it destroys the *adversary* of God and man, and all that can *hurt* or afflict. God is not the destroyer of his children. Remember this. He next quotes the declaration of Christ, "Broad is the way, &c., and *many* go in &c.; and narrow is the way, and *few*," &c. We acknowledge, that *destruction* is the consequence of going in the *broad way*, &c., but, the prophet says, "Who redeemeth my life *from destruction*." Again, the "*many* who go in it," are *justified*, and do not know it; for says the Scriptures, "By his knowledge, shall my righteous servant justify *many*." Again, "By the obedience of one, shall *many* be made *righteous*." Our refuter asks, "is the *destruction* here spoken of *temporal* punishment?" And adds, "No one who consults the Scriptures will pretend so!" What! Please to *reverse* this. Our *refuter*, all at once, drops his *infallibility*, and becomes an inquirer; in this *shape*, we think he will appear to much better advantage, and the inquiry, is, because Christ "tells us but *few* enter in at the strait gate; and if so, *those* who *die* in their sins, are *irrecoverably* lost. If this is *not* the case, what did our Saviour mean, when he said, "What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" And adds, wonderful to relate,—"Can that soul be *lost*, that is to be *restored* to a state of happiness? Certainly not!" This is indeed astonishing blindness. What could our student be thinking about. Pray, can any thing be *found*, without it is first *lost*? Christ said, he came to "*seek* and to *save* that which *was lost!*" Now, can that soul be *lost*, which is *sought* out, and *saved*? 'Certainly not!' Where was our student's eyes, that he could not see? Is he not in *gehenna*?

Note. The Jews, and even the disciples of Christ, wished for a *temporal* Saviour, to free them from the Roman yoke, and establish their sovereignty in a temporal kingdom. The salvation of *their* souls *depended* upon the *spirituality* of the *kingdom* of Christ. Therefore, the question put them by Christ, is explained. Namely,—Supposing you were freed from the Roman power, and were masters, yourselves, of all the world, what benefit would result to you in the end; if *I*, who am to be a *Spiritual* King, and reign in *heaven*, should only give you a *temporal* kingdom, and reign with you on earth?

Answer to the Sincere Inquirer.

(*Continued from page* 108.)

The Editor after making a number of observations, (which I omit here) says, "We ask Theophilus, where he obtained his authority for calling Christ, the *flesh*; and describing him as *made under the outward covenant*, to end a shadowy dispensation."

Ans. 1. Theophilus no where in his address to the Inquirer after Truth, called Christ the *flesh*. For he believed Christ's visible *flesh* veiled his invisible substance, which no natural eye could or can see. The Editor's accusation here is erroneous, and a misconstruction.

Ans. 2. The outward covenant is the *law*. Gal. iv. 21, 24. Heb. viii. 9. Exod. xxxiv. 27. Deut. iv. 13. I prove that Christ was made under the outward covenant, or law, Heb. ix. to end a shadowy dispensation: 1st. By the Bible history. 2d. By Gal. iv. 4, 5. Mat. xxiii. 3d ibid v. 17, 18, 19, &c. 3d. By his own concession, page 30. Col. 2.

1 The Bible history relates, that Jesus Christ was made (or born) under the existence of the law, was circumcised according to it, and was brought up under its administration and authority.

2 Paul explicitly declared to the Galatians, that "God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them who were under the law." By this, we are taught, that the redemption performed by Jesus in his outward coming was the salvation of the Jews from an outward covenant, testament, or law; and not to save all mankind from their past, present and future sins: Accordingly Paul says, Eph. ii. 14. that Jesus broke down the middle wall of partition, and abolished in his flesh the enmity [between the Jew and Gentile] even the law of commandments contained in ordinances;" and Jesus confirmed this doctrine, by saying, he was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; Mat. xv. 24. Jesus Christ commanded the multitude, during his abode in the veil of flesh, to observe and do all that the scribes and Pharisees, who sat in Moses' seat, bid them observe and do, Mat. xxiii. 3. He would not have commanded this obedience to the law, if the old covenant had then come to an end. "Think not (said he) that I am come [in this my outward presence] to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but fulfil, &c. and not one jot or tittle of the law [which was a shadow of good things to come] was to pass till all be fulfilled." Heb. x. 1. Mat. v. 17, &c. The typical law and dispensation ended, when Jesus said on the cross, "it is finished, and gave up the spirit." Lo! then the veil of the holy of holies in the temple was rent asunder! Shadows and types ceased, and "the hand-writing of ordinances were taken away"; being nailed to his cross." Col. ii. 14. Then an end of all sins under the law, (agreeable to Dan. ix. 24) and the 70 weeks, were completed, which the angel Gabriel told Daniel were determined upon his people, and upon the holy city, "to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, to make recon-

ciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness." The new covenant could not be brought in, nor the sins against it atoned for, till the old covenant, and sins against it, were ended and put away by the sacrifice of the body of Jesus on the cross. According to Hebrews ix. 16. the administration of the New Testament could not commence before the death of the testator; "for where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator;" which is a plain proof, that Jesus lived and died under the old covenant, and put an end to it; for the death of the testator was necessary to give the New Testament *force*. Christ was not a mediator of the Old Testament; "he is the Mediator of the New Testament, (not of the letter, but of the Spirit) that by means of death, (for what?) for the redemption of the transgressions under the first Testament,—they which are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. ix. 14. Here we may observe, he redeemed from the *sins* and *transgressions under the first Testament, by means of death*. The sins and transgressions of which Testament, necessarily continued as long as the law remained, but no longer. "Now once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. verse 26. What sins, except the sins under the Mosaic dispensation, could be put away from amongst free-agents by the sacrifice of his visible body?

3. The Editor has also expressly declared, that, "*Christ came in the end of the ages*, (or Mosaical dispensation) or world." Page 30. Col. 2. If he came in the end of the Mosaical dispensation, he did not come after the end, and consequently, his first coming was *under* the Mosaical dispensation.

(To be continued.)

ANSWER.

It is with pleasure that we see the dawn of reason in Theophilus. The obscurity which has distinguished his communications, would be a sufficient excuse for a very great misconstruction on *our* part; and we should be better pleased to find that *we* had unintentionally misunderstood, than that *he* had intentionally misconstrued, and perverted. We however leave to the judgment of the reader, the decision of this matter. Number 19, page 75, 2 col. at the close of Theophilus' first communication will be found the subject disputed, &c. We do not recollect of ever denying the *manner*, or *end*, of Christ's coming. It is what *he came for*, which is, it appears, the matter in dispute The declaration of Theophilus in his *fifth* paragraph,—"By *this* we are taught, that the redemption performed by Jesus in his outward coming was the *salvation* of the *Jews* from an outward *covenant, testament, or law;* and *not to save all mankind*, from their *past, present*, and *future sins*. Accordingly Paul says, Ephesians, ii. 14," &c. We think this is so *plain* that Theophilus will not in future *deny* it. The matter is now fairly at issue; and we pledge ourselves to *prove* that this statement of Theophilus' is *destitute* of all foundation, *except* the evidence of Theophilus himself, and others, whose testimony contradicting the *positive* declaration of God by his prophets, &c., is *good for nothing!* Reader, look at Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, i. 9, 10. Paul declares, that "God has made known unto us the mystery of his *will*, &c., that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ," &c. Now, we ask, is this *salvation*? Can you *deny* this to be the *will* of *God*? What said the Holy Spirit? "Lo, I come, to do thy will, O God. By which *will we are sanctified*, (How? When?) through the offering of the *body of Jesus Christ* once *for all*. For by *one* offering he hath *perfected* for ever *them* that are *sanctified*" Hebrews x. 9, 10, 14. What *is* the body of Christ? "Be it known unto you (says Paul) that Christ is the Head of every man, we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." And in Eph. i. 22, 23. "And hath put all under his feet, and gave him the *head* over all to the Church; which is *his body*, the *fulness* of him that filleth *all in all*." Again, see Isaiah xlix. 6. "And he said, It is a *light thing* that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will *also* give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that *thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth*." We ask Theophilus, whether he does not contend that the *coming* of *Christ* was a '*light thing?*' Christ declared, that he "came to *save the world*,—that he gave his *life* for the *world*,"—and that when he "was lifted up, he would draw *all unto him*." We ask Theophilus in plain terms, Was not Christ *offered* up nearly 1800 years ago? And did he "not by *one offering* perfect for ever those that are sanctified?" Now look again at Ephesians, and particularly, at the 2d chap. 13th, 14th and 15th verses. "But now in Christ Jesus ye who were sometime afar off, (were these the Jews? if you think so, look at the 12th verse And if Gentiles, remember *their peace* was *made*, and they made nigh by *one offering!*) are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made *both one*, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, the *law* of commandments in ordinances, for to make *in himself* of *twain one new* man, *so* making peace,' &c. Reader, this is the *testimony* of God's prophet and Apostle—now look at the *testimony* of Theophilus—"The redemption performed by Jesus in his *outward* coming (i. e. when he came in the flesh!) *was* the salvation of *the Jews*, &c., and NOT to SAVE *all mankind*," &c. Reader, we have entered but the very *threshold* of the evidence we can produce from the scriptures against this *heresy;* enough, however, has been said. Theophilus has expounded the declaration of Paul, the '*enmity*, the *law* of commandments,' to *mean*, the '*enmity between Jew and Gentile!!!*' We shall expect Theophilus to produce *better* authority for this *exposition*, than his *own* opinion, especially, as it *contradicts*, and is contradicted *by* the same apostle, see Col. ii. 14. where Paul says, it was 'the *handwriting of ordinances*, that was against us," &c. Theophilus adds, "And Jesus confirmed *this* doctrine, by saying, he was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," Matt. xv. 24. The reader, by looking at this chapter, will find, that Christ was conversing with a Gentile woman, &c., and the subject was, *not* the salvation of the soul, but the *healing* the *body!* Now we have *one* question to ask Theophilus, Was the *law ever binding* upon any *man* or *nation*, except *the Jews?* We shall dismiss this part of the subject, until we get an answer to *this*, and the above *questions*.

Theophilus ends his *fifth* paragraph, thus,—"Here we may observe, he redeemed from the sins and transgressions under the *first* testament, by means of death; the sins and transgression of which testament necessarily continued as long as the law *remained*, but no longer.—Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Hebrews ix. 26. What *sins*, under the Mosaical dispensation *could* be put away from amongst free-agents by the sacrifice of his visible body?" To this we answer, we know nothing about "*free-agents*," they are a *genus* that we never read about in the Scriptures. But, the *human race*, or descendants of Adam, the Scriptures give account of. The prophet declares, "by his knowledge, shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." The apostle, "By the righteousness of one (Christ,) *the free gift came* upon all men unto justification of life. And as in Adam *all die*, even so in Christ shall *all* be made *alive*." But in *full*, is the testimony of Christ himself. See John vi. 51. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that *I will give is my flesh*, which I will give for the *life of the world*."

Theophilus' *sixth* paragraph, number 3, reads thus,—"The Editor has also expressly declared, that 'Christ came in the end of the ages, (or Mosaical dispensation) or world." Page 30. col. 2. "If he came in the end of the Mosaical dispensation, he did *not* come *after* the end; and consequently his *first* coming was under the Mosaical dispensation." *Here* is the *balance*, in which we shall *weigh* Theophilus. And it is a *true* one, for it is *sealed* with the declaration of the apostle, see Heb. x. 11, 12, 13, 14. "But this man, after he had offered *one sacrifice* for sins, *for ever sat down* on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by *one offering* he hath perfected *for ever* them that are sanctified." Reader, does this look like the doctrine of the *first* coming of Christ being *insufficient;* and a *second* coming in the flesh of his people necessary to *sanctify* them? No! Here is the *balance;* and we *fear*, that Theophilus on being *weighed*, will be found *wanting!*

(To be continued.)

"Let not him that girdeth on his armour boast himself as he that putteth it off."

The Methodist preacher who very recently and exultingly called upon Universalists to prove the truth of their doctrine, is informed, that if *he* will *step out* of his pulpit into the *columns* of this paper, he shall have an opportunity to prove the truth of *his own*, and the falsehood of *ours;* and farther, we assure him, that he shall receive very particular attention, and have no cause to complain of being slighted or overlooked. And we likewise inform him, that whatever may be the result, as respects his ability to advocate *his* own doctrine, or refute *ours*, it would *add*, at least, to his reputation for SINCERITY.

"LOVE WORKETH NO ILL"—

"And God" is love; therefore God worketh no ill to any of his creatures. But if the popular doctrine of endless, unmerciful punishment be true, it seems to contradict the above scriptural position. No one can doubt in this case: for endless misery must be considered by all, a real evil. It would be such most certainly to the wretch who should endure it. Did God, who is love, from all eternity determine the endless misery of any of his creatures, according to the popular creed? If so, why do we not hear those preachers, who believe and teach such doctrine, labour to set up and maintain, that God so loved the greatest part of mankind, that he appointed them to endless wrath before the foundation of the world? Why do we not hear them proclaiming, that God so loved the world, that he has determined to send his Son to judge and condemn the world to everlasting wo? Why do they not catch the sacred flame, and rejoice in hope of the endless triumphs of sin and death over the greatest part of mankind? The answers to these questions are obvious, it would be the height of absurdity so to do. It evidently appears, that while our preachers hold up the idea that a God of love has predetermined the everlasting misery of his creatures, they at the same time deeply regret it. They appear to be exceedingly sorrowful, they shed many tears of grief because they believe what they preach. But if that God, who is love, has determined this thing, is it not evident, that nothing but hatred can oppose it? If love has appointed mankind to endless misery, then it is certain, that if God had been hatred, he would have appointed men to endless felicity. There can be no fellowship, no agreement, no concord between love and hatred. If our preachers would carefully and candidly examine this subject, they would save themselves much sorrow, their hearers much torment, and avoid very great inconsistencies. If we allow that God is love, and that love worketh no ill, we have abundant reason to rejoice in all the appointments of the great and good Ruler of the universe.

Boston Universalist Magazine.

To Correspondents.

Dean, An Impartialist, and C of New-Jersey, are received.

We find it necessary, again to request those of our correspondents who are in the habit of writing a great quantity of matter, on a small quantity of paper, to use more paper. If this is not attended to, we fear circumstances will oblige us to pronounce manuscripts which are unintelligible, and which do not communicate, to be no communications. It neither comports with our duty, or leisure, to transcribe. Let him that writeth, write plain.

Errata.

In Number 28, page 113, col. 2, 20th line from top, for *deserts*, read *dessert*. In col. 3. 32d line from bottom, for *Ephes.* xi. read *Ephes.* ii. In page 116, 1st col. last line, for *30th chap.* read *25th.* In Number 25, page 101, 1 col 26th line from the bottom, for *Cor.* 11 *chap.* read *Cor.* 2*d chap.*

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1820. NO. 30.

COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—Although I can boast of no other than a very limited education, and am engaged in active commercial pursuits, I cannot forego the opportunity presented me in the columns of a paper established on so liberal a plan as the Gospel Herald, of indulging a strong inclination to say with the Psalmist, "Come hither all ye that fear the Lord, and I will tell you what he hath done for my soul." And addressing my fellow sinners in the language of the prophet, as prisoners of hope, how cheering to the fearful and desponding spirits of those who are labouring under the gloomy uncertainty of the prevailing doctrines of the present day, is the proclamation, "Turn you to the strong hold, ye prisoners of hope?" Zech. ix. 12. Again, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matthew xi. 28. To whom did the Saviour address these gracious words? Was it not to those Jews who were under the tuition of instructors who took away the key of knowledge, which was Christ, the only key that could unlock the mysteries of all the typical sacrifices, offerings, and atonements under the legal dispensation? Instructors, who like most of the preachers in our day, taught the people to expect salvation by their own works; lading them with the burden of propitiating the offended Deity, by keeping the law in all its purity, and by their penitence, sorrow, weeping and crying, and our divines have superadded the doctrine, that we cannot obtain salvation until we have become just as willing to be *damned* as to be *saved!*

It is about ten years since I became greatly troubled in spirit, from a deep sense of the awful consequence of sin, the wages of which I was made most bitterly to feel, even moral or spiritual death; for being enabled to discover by a ray of light from the Sun of Righteousness, the perfect holiness and purity of him who searcheth the heart, and requireth truth in the inward parts, by the same light I saw my own impurity, and as I understood not the life bestowing truth, that Jesus was made unto me wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; I considered myself an object of the entire displeasure of my Creator. But such was his goodness, that by his Spirit he enabled me to plead for mercy with such strength of faith as I had never known before, and which strongly impressed upon my mind the words of Jacob, This is none other than the house of God; and that it was my privilege to wrestle with God as Jacob did, and truly by his gracious Spirit I so prevailed as to obtain a full assurance, that with him there was abundant mercy and love to men, the chief of sinners. In a short time, however, that baleful spirit of fear and unbelief, to which the heart is constantly prone, caused me to sink, as did Peter, at the sight of the boisterous wave. And here I think proper to notice one of the errors of Calvinism, and which, as I was educated a Calvinist, proved a source of great disquietude and despondency of spirit in my subsequent religious exercises; I mean the doctrine, that at regeneration there is an implantation of an holy, active, abiding, and living principle in the soul, called by some a *change of heart*, a new man, Christ within *us*, inherent holiness, &c., all which I had been taught to believe were in every Christian, and therefore, when the world, the flesh and a tempting adversary caused me to realize that in me there was neither light, strength, or holiness, I concluded mine could not be the faith of God's elect. But I have since learned, that a believer is as dependent on the Author and Finisher of his faith, for light and strength for every succeeding day, as he was for the first ray that beamed on his understanding. And as Paul counted all things loss, that he might win Christ, so would the adherents to the orthodoxy of the day be incalculable gainers by the loss of their imagined inward holiness and sanctification, that they might embrace the glorious reality of their righteousness in Christ, in whom alone they have given to them all spiritual blessings. The Scriptural account of regeneration is as follows. *First*, "That God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Eph. ii. 4, 5, 6. so that we are, according to our *union* with our *head*, and our being *in him* as members of *his* body, crucified, dead, and raised to life with him, as saith the apostle, "because we thus judge; that if one died for all, then were all dead; (or, all died,) and he died *for all*, that they which *live* should not henceforth live unto *themselves*, but unto him who died for them and rose again." 1 Cor. ii. 5, 14, 15. Now, as regeneration is to bring to a new life that which hath been deprived of its first life, the above texts show, that we who lost our *first* life in Adam, are restored to a new and more glorious life in *Christ*, he being to us *spiritually*, the very same that Adam was to us *naturally*,—for as Adam was our head, so is Christ the head of every man. 1 Cor. chap. xi. 3. And as we had such a being in Adam as rendered us partakers of his transgression and death, we had a being in Christ, which rendered us partakers of his righteousness and life, according to Paul's declaration, Rom. v. 18. "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." And again, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. 22. It was a perfect knowledge of this regeneration that Paul so earnestly sought, as he saith, "that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." Eph. iii. 10. Again, "I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." Eph. iii. 12. Paul desired to understand perfectly his spiritual being in Christ, by which he was made partaker of all the blessings resulting from his perfect work of obedience, suffering, resurrection and intercession. It was this regeneration by which God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. And it is the knowledge of being thus reconciled to God, or in other words, seeing and tasting by faith, which is of the operation of God's Spirit, that the Lord is gracious to us, vile, and sinful, as we have been made to see ourselves, that fills us with joy and peace; yea, it is by this that our hearts are directed unto the love of God, so that we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. Because we see by this enlightening spirit of faith that there is with God abundant mercy, love and favour, toward us, though we are polluted by sin and transgression. So that this direct and experimental teaching of the Spirit, is in substance the very same as is expressed in the words above quoted, namely, "that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Now the above described teaching and enlightening of the benighted soul of man, by the Spirit of Christ, is called in Scripture a being *born again*, and should never be confounded with, or thought to be the same as regeneration; for they are as different from each other, as to raise a dead man to life would be different from our coming into our present mode of existence by natural birth. Christ, in answer to Nicodemus, used the natural birth as the most appropriate figure by which to describe the change in the state of the mind produced by those enlightenings of his Spirit, and which is emerging from a state of mental darkness into a state of mental light; or in Scripture language, being delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son, Colos. i. 13. He then uses the *wind*, as another figure, to illustrate the nature of this spiritual work; showing, that as we have no other evidence of the existence of the wind, than the effects which it produces, so the subject of this work does not, neither can he truly know the Spirit, until his eyes are opened by his enlightening influences, and that the Spirit, like the wind, operates when, and upon whom the Author of all good hath determined.

As I have now shown what I believe to be the doctrine of regeneration, and of the Spiritual birth, according to the Scriptures, I proceed to give my views relative to their design and effects. First, Their design.—*Rregeneration*, or our being made *alive in Christ* in our *collective* mode of existence which we had in him spiritually, secures to us a participation in all the blessings arising from the obedience, sufferings, resurrection, and intercession, as it is written, "for both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one." Heb. ii. 11. And again, "If one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; and if one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it." And again, "we are made accepted *in* the Beloved." Eph. i. 6. "And he hath entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. ix. 24. If it then appears, as I conceive it certainly does, from the above testimonies, which are but a few of the numerous passages of Scripture of the same import, that *our regeneration*, which was effected by our having a spiritual and *collective* mode of existence *in Christ*, when he obeyed, suffered, died, and rose again, hath secured to us all spiritual blessings in him, it follows as a certain and natural effect of a cause, that in due time, each member of this body will in their individual mode of existence perfectly and fully enjoy all the blessings so promised for them. But that none will thus perfectly and fully enjoy them in this life, is manifest, both from Scripture and experience. But it is also manifested by the same evidences, that an earnest of them is enjoyed in this life, by such a number of the members, as are denominated in Scripture the *first fruits* of the *harvest*, "for we are a kind of first fruits of his creatures." Jam. i. 18. "For if the first fruit be holy the lump is also holy." Rom. xi. 16. For we know, that the *whole creation* groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now. And not only they, but we ourselves also, which have the *first fruits* of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the *redemption of our body*. Rom. viii. 22, 23. Which first fruits I understand to be the *elect*, according to the foreknowledge of God; and which have in every generation constituted the visible church of God, and who are called the excellent of the earth, a city set on an hill, the salt of the earth, &c.

And that this earnest of the Spirit may be enjoyed by such a portion of the family of man, as in every generation constitute the *elect*, the *first* fruits of the *whole harvest*, it became necessary that they should be *born* again, or born of the Spirit, by whose enlightening operations they should be delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son; and without which, they could neither see nor enter into the kingdom of God, or the gospel church state and privileges, which is meant by the kingdom of God, of which Christ was speaking to Nicodemus, John iii. 3, 5, &c. Hence, the designs and end of the spiritual birth, is to qualify us for the enjoyment of the blessings and privileges of the church in its present and imperfect state; for all must acknowledge the truth of the declaration of the apostle, that "it doth not appear what we shall be," we are not fitted or prepared for the enjoyment of heaven in this life; and for the

best of reasons, we are not to have it *here*. Quere. If we are not to be prepared for,nor enjoy heaven in this state, when shall we? *Ans.* After death. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved; we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." 2 Cor. v. 1, 2. From which it appears, that our personal fitness for heaven must take place after the dissolution of our earthly tabernacle, and not while we are at home in the body.

In the spirit of meekness and love I desire to call upon those of every denomination who believe, and teach, that the change they call the *new* birth *prepares* them for, and *gives* them a *title* to heaven and its enjoyments; and that without such change in *this life*, none can ever enter heaven, and denying that any *change* can take place *after* death, to pause, to reflect, and ask themselves, communing with their own hearts on the subject, whether the most pious and perfect ever are in this life sufficiently purified for an entrance into the immediate presence of our holy and blessed Creator? and if they answer in the negative, and there be no change *after death*, do not they, by excluding the greatest part of the human family from salvation, on the ground of their not being cleansed and prepared for that state, on the very same ground exclude themselves, and thus, by their attempts to avoid the damnable error, as they have been taught to call the doctrine of the salvation of all men, complete the ruin of, and plunge to eternal perdition the whole race of men? Such are the consequences of departing from truth, and attempting to establish and teach for doctrine the traditions of such men as Calvin, Arminius, Hopkins, &c.

Brethren, for as such, I am authorized to address you, by whatever sectarian name you may be distinguished, Have we not all one Father,hath not one God created us? Why should we deal treacherously, every man against his brother? Mal. ii. 10. O! ye fearful and unbelieving, my mouth is open unto you; ye are not straitened in or by the testimonies of Christ and his apostles; but ye are straitened in your own bowels,or hearts,by receiving the narrow-hearted systems of men, who have *limited the good news* and glad tidings of peace and good-will, which is to all people, to a *few*, a very few. Brethren, what can be the design of our Saviour in granting us the enlightenings of his Spirit, but that we should enjoy the consolations arising from a knowledge of the things which belong to our peace, which is the earnest of the Spirit? We walk by faith,and not by sight; and through patience and comfort of the Scriptures have hope of the glory that shall be revealed in us, when our light afflictions here are ended. Surely then, our spiritual birth qualifies us only for the spiritual life that we live in this state; just as our natural birth does for our natural life, and so far are we from possessing in *ourselves* the life of that heavenly state, that we are assured,by the declaration of Paul, that we are *dead*, and our life is hid with Christ *in* God.

If these conclusions are just, and I think nothing but prejudice can resist the testimonies adduced in their support, it follows, that the change which takes place in this life, called in the Scriptures a being *born again*, has no more to do in procuring for us the heavenly inheritance, than to inform a child that his father would give to him a large estate, would be giving him a title, and putting him into the immediate possession of it. And that a change *after* death, by which we must be transformed into the likeness of him, who is our life, and made personally the partakers of his holiness,is alike indispensable to those who believe in this life, and those who do not; or, in other words,—there is no *difference* as to the certainty of eternal life, between those who believe *in* this life, and those who do *not*, but that the *former* are brought to the knowledge of their being heirs to their heavenly inheritance *sooner* than the *latter;* who will know nothing, either of their heirship or inheritance, until they are ushered into the possession and enjoyment of them. It must be acknowledged, that he who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time, will be as able to *reveal* his glory in those to whom it has not been his pleasure to grant the knowledge of himself in this life, as he will be to reveal it to *those* who enjoyed such knowledge. But will he indeed reveal his glory in all? Let his word decide. It is written, that "all nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name. Psal. lxxxvi. 9. Unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength. Isa. xlv. 23, 24. That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. Heb. ii. 9. As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. 1 Cor. xv. 22. I will give thee the heathen thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth thy possession. Psalm ii. 8. As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousnes of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. Rom. v. 18. And he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. 1 John ii. 2. God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. John iii. 17. I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. John xii. 47. That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him." Eph. i. 10. And what should I say more? For the time would fail me to quote you the numerous testimonies of Christ and his apostles, and all God's holy prophets, who have testified of the *restitution of all things* since the world began.

Wherefore, seeing we are compassed about with so *great a cloud of inspired witnesses*, let us lay aside every human tradition which are deceptions that easily beset, and dreadfully bewilder and perplex us, and run with patience the race set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, and not to Calvin, Arminius, Hopkins, and other blind leaders of the blind, who are the authors of unbelief, because they are the authors of contradiction, and of such absurdities as darken the minds, and harden the hearts of their adherents. Having given my views, relative to the doctrine of regeneration, and of the *new* or spiritual birth, I shall here conclude my present address to my fellow sinners; but if God permit, I shall in a subsequent communication endeavour to go on a more perfect or more general view of the character and work of the Saviour of the world. In the mean time I ask the favour, that whatever appears like unnecessary repetition,may be attributed to a desire to be understood,and deficiencies in composition, to a situation in life not permitting a study of that science. As I have felt it my duty and privilege to testify to the things, which I trust I have been truly taught to know, as belonging to the everlasting peace of a lost world, with all humility I subscribe myself,

WITNESS.

For the Gospel Herald.

Universalism on a Broad Scale.

"For the creature (or creation) was made subject to vanity (imperfect) not willingly (or wantonly) but by reason of him (Christ) who hath subjected the same in hope." God created all things by, and for Jesus Christ. Col i. 16. Hence, we may fairly infer, that they are through him subjects of hope. "Now hope maketh not ashamed;" this hope extends beyond what we at present see, for to our shame, we *now see* our imperfections, but blessed be God, the things we *now* see are *temporal*, and the things *not seen* are *eternal*. Now there is a prospect in Christ of immortality and glory; and in us, a desire for the same; so that by our union *in*, and with Christ, the prospect in him, and the desire in us, are married, and become hope, sure and steadfast. Thus we are subjected in hope. Let this serve as a preliminary introduction to the subject, as follows.

First. Of God the Creator, Redeemer, and Comforter.

Second. Of *creation* under the watch-care of God.

Third. Of its present imperfection.

Fourth. Of its final perfection, under the perfecting hand of God.

First. Of God. We have a true revelation of his Divine nature and character in the Holy Scriptures. That his nature is *love*, and his character lovely, is obvious. He is the only true and living God; without beginning of days, or end of life. The Almighty. We have many exalted terms, by which we express our ideas of Deity; but after all, we fall far short in our conceptions of his infinite perfections. God is the Maker of all things,—the Sovereign of all worlds. The Great Architect of the universe. His *plan*, like himself, is infinite. Infinite love is the moving principle in all his ways, and works; and infinite perfection the end of his works. There is a particular relation subsisting between the Creator and created. This was manifested in Jesus Christ, by a mystic union of the Divine and human nature. In this is seen the mediation between the Creator and created. God is every where present in his providence, and influencing by his Spirit. God has but *one will*, which will must effect the great object of redemption; and eventuate in the happiness of the universe.

Of the *creation* under God's watch care. The whole creation is like a tender infant under the fostering care of a kind nurse,and wholly dependent on God; who supplies the wants, and affords protection to all. But man, like the froward child, is ignorant, and murmurs at the government of his Maker.

Third. Of the present imperfect state of creation. It was subjected to vanity. And the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain, waiting to be delivered. It must be remembered, that though God's will as to his final design can never be frustrated, yet all that bears the name of sin is opposed to his will; hence the existence of a law forbidding sin. This law is according to his will; and by consequence, sin must be against his will; this is a strong argument, and supported by reason and Scripture, why God will make an end of sin. God's will is to make his creatures finally happy. To be *happy*, they must be *holy;* for *sin* and *misery* are *cause* and *consequence*.

Fourth. The final perfection of the whole, must result as an inevitable consequence, "by reason of (or in consequence of the redemption of) him, who hath subjected the whole in hope. Because the creature (the whole creation) itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." The apostle likewise informs us, in his epistle to the Ephes. i. 11. that 'God worketh all things after the counsel of his own will. And 1 Timothy ii. 4. That he will have all men to be saved (first) and (then) come to the knowledge of the truth.' From which I infer, that God never works in his decrees or providence, against the salvation of any man; but for the salvation of ALL. Therefore, Scripture and reason both teaches, that God's plan is good; and he being Almighty, it must be accomplished. God has declared, that 'he has no pleasure in the death of the sinner.' The *death* of the *sinner*, therefore, makes no part of the plan of Infinite Wisdom. God has pleasure in salvation; therefore,salvation, and not the reverse, shall reign and triumph. Hence, it appears to me blasphemous, to say, that sin and misery will be endless; for it is fighting against God, under the dusky banners of hell. The archives of heathenish idolatry cannot furnish a more gloomy and repugnant doctrine, than the modern doctrine of endless torments, which is dishonourable to a merciful God, and chilling to the soul of every benevolent man. But this foul stain will be wiped away and effaced from creation, by the manifestation of the God of love, the Saviour of the world. Then shall "all nations whom God hath made come and worship before him, and glorify his name." Calvinists, contrast this Bible system, with the delusion of your sect; and this glorious result, with the miserable issue of your corrupt principles; and in the contrast behold your condemnation,—for you have *chosen darkness* rather than *light*, because your deeds are *evil*.

MYSTICUS.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Those who know little of the foundation of our faith, decry the doctrine of the *equal* goodness of

God, as a principle leading to *licentiousness*. My present design is not to gainsay a declaration betraying so much ignorance of our common motives to action, but merely to exhibit the testimony of one whom the multitude esteem orthodox, in contrast to the pretended insufficiency of its opposite doctrine to promote its intended effect. If by their own confession, the *fear* of never-ending misery will neither *restrain* men from vice, nor *incite* them to virtue, it might be well to pause, and inquire, whether the doctrine is indeed of God, or merely of man's invention. The quotation to which I allude, is found in the works of the Rev. Thomas Scott, author of a commentary on the Bible, and is as follows:—

"And yet *facts undeniably* show, that men venture upon *sin*, even with the threatening of *everlasting misery* sounding in their ears; nay, with the trembling apprehension of it dismaying their hearts; for *Divine*, as well as *human* laws, are *weak* through the *flesh;* and with all their sanctions and barriers, are unable to affix boundaries to the swelling tide of human depravity." I shall trouble you with one other quotation from the same author, which I cannot reconcile with the latter part of the former.

In speaking of God, he says, "His character, as there delineated, comprises all possible excellence, without any intermixture; his *laws* and ordinances accord to his perfections; his works and dispensations exhibit them; and all his dealings with his creatures, bear the stamp of Infinite wisdom, power, justice, purity, truth, goodness, and mercy, harmoniously displayed."

I will only add, what a *pity* it is, that the *laws* of an Omnipotent, wise, just, and good God, should be so *weak* through the *flesh*, as to fail ultimately in their intended object!

MENTOR.

REMARKS.

We think the cogitations of Mentor are deserving of consideration. The doctrine of never-ending torment is based alone upon the *foolish* supposition, that *suffering* is indispensably necessary to lead men to *repentance*, and to *deter* the *repentant* from the commission of *fresh* crime and transgression. There is not in nature a greater contradiction and absurdity; nor is it possible to conceive of a contrast greater, than is exhibited in the difference between this *monster in orthodoxy*, and the doctrine taught in the Scriptures. The Scriptures declare, that "The *goodness* of God leadeth to *repentance*." And the *motive* there assigned for *loving* and *serving* God, is, *not* to *escape his vengeance*,—but, "We *love him because he first loved us!!!*"

We seriously ask the teachers of this abominable absurdity, if they wish to have their children *obey and love them* from the fear of a *whipping;* or, from *gratitude* for the *love* and affection which they cherish towards them?

If clergymen who preach this *miserable* doctrine, were to carry a *whip*, instead of *money*, into the markets, and tender *castigation* in exchange for the *provisions* they wanted, we think their *consistency* and *success* would equal their present *threatening* bargains, which they (to use their own words, "in God's stead") make from their pulpits!

Religious Intelligence.

We notice with *pleasure*, at the request of a correspondent at Preston, Conn. the organization of a society of believers in the salvation of God for a lost world, by the name and style, of the "*United Society of Christian Friends*," composed of members from the towns of Norwich, Preston, and Groton, at Norwich, Conn.

This Society was organized October 19th, 1820, and commenced under circumstances highly encouraging to its members, and honourable to other denominations; who with a liberality becoming the charity of those who name the name of Jesus, manifested their *faith* by their *works*, and with a generosity as honourable as rare, accommodated their *dissenting brethren* with their houses of worship. May this spirit of love and harmony continue to increase, and its influence extend, until all bitterness, and wrath, and evil speaking be done away; and heaven-born *charity*, gentle, and easy to be entreated of, fill every *bosom*, and warm, with the fire of devotional love, every *heart*.

Rev. Edward Mitchell, pastor of the *United Society of Christian Friends*" in this city, was present, and performed the religious duties on this occasion. He preached to willing and attentive audiences in the Methodist Church, at Norwich-landing; in Rev. Mr. Strong's Church, in Norwich; and at Groton, Pocquetanoc, and Jewet's city, &c.

The friends of truth have abundant cause to rejoice. Their cause is the cause of the universe. It is of God; and therefore *cannot* come to nought. It stands in high and incomparable pre-eminence. It has the prayers of its enemies,—the faith of its friends, and the power of Omnipotence for its support. Not a Calvinist but prays, "Thy will, O God, be done!" Not an infidel but must acknowledge,—"This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who *will* have *all men* to be *saved*, and come to the knowledge of the truth." 1 Timothy ii. 3, 4.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Answer to the Sincere Inquirer.

(*Continued.*)

What has been already said, fully answers the interrogations of the Editor, but as we are on an important topic we will proceed. The gospel dispensation is "*a ministration of the Spirit*," (according to 2 Cor. ii. Christ and his disciples preached that the *kingdom of heaven* spoken of by Daniel) was *at hand*. chap. ii. v. 44. In Matt. xvi. 28. he said, There are some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Christ Jesus was the *heir*, (Mat. xxi. 30.) yet in his incarnated condition under the law, Paul says, "he differed nothing from a *servant*, though he was *Lord* of all." Gal. iv. He was made under *the law* to *redeem* them that were under the law from its *servitude and bondage;* to end a shadowy dispensation, and introduce "the *ministration of the Spirit*," which is the dispensation of the gospel.

Agar is the bond-woman or first covenant, and gendereth to *bondage;* and Paul calls the law, (or mount Sinai,) *Agar*. Gal. iv. Christ Jesus came to *liberate* from this *bondage*, and declared, that he was not sent (in his *external* advent) to any but to the Jews, who were under the yoke of *bondage*. Matt. xv. 24. Therefore, before his crucifixion, he sent none of his disciples to preach to the *Gentiles*, for he "commanded them not to go into the way of the Gentiles, or into any city of the Samaritans, but to go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" and to preach, not that his kingdom, or dispensation of the Spirit, was yet come; but that it was at hand. Mat. x. 5, 6. This kingdom commenced, when "the *partition* wall [between Jew and Gentile] was broken down;" Christ having [says Paul to the Galatian churches] *redeemed* us from the *curse* of the law, that the *blessing* of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive (what?) the *promise of the Spirit* through faith." Gal. iii. 13, 14. From these quotations we may see, that the blessing of Abraham which was to come on the Gentiles [or nations] *was the promise of the Spirit* through faith." Rom. iv. 13. After Abraham had patiently endured, he *obtained the promise*. Heb. vi. 15. And this *promise* of the Spirit or ministration of it, was waited for and received by the disciples of Christ. See Luke xxiv. 49. Acts i. 4. ii. 33. See also John xiv. 16, 26, 27. xv. 26. xvi. 7.

Jesus told his disciples it was expedient that he should go away, as to his outward presence, to end the law, and the sins against the law, by the sacrifice of himself; so that he might come again in his spiritual kingdom of the new covenant as the Spirit of truth or Comforter. For he said to them, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the *Comforter*, [in Greek *Paracleton*, which is translated *advocate*, and is Christ Jesus the righteous, 1 John ii. 1.] will not come unto you. But if I [as to this outward presence] depart, I will send *him* unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come. John xiv. 16. and xvi. 7, 8. When Paul reasoned of temperance, righteousness, and of *judgment to come*, this Spirit of truth (verse 13) made Felix tremble. Doubtless it was the spirit of prophecy, [Rev. xix. 10.] operating on his mind, and foretelling by its impression on his heart, that warned Felix of his unfitness and unpreparedness *for judgment to come!* Solemn and awful assize! It was the same Spirit that beareth witness with the spirits of those, (who by hearing, believing and obeying it, become reconciled,) that beareth witness with their spirit that they are the children of God; and that it shall be well with them, when they go hence, and are seen of men no more. For this spirit, (which knoweth the things of God,) gives them to feel that futurity shall be pleasant to them; and they behold, as in a glass, how it shall be with them, when time shall be no more. "If ye love me, keep my commandments; and I will pray the Father, and he shall send you *another Comforter*, that he may abide with you *for ever;* even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it *seeth him not*, neither knoweth him. But *ye* know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be *in you*." Here we should notice, that the *visible Comforter with them*, promises to come and be their *spiritual Comforter in them for ever;* provided he went away externally, and took out of the way and nailed to the cross the hand-writing of ordinances, and put away the sins committed under the law, "*by the sacrifice of himself*," as before observed, and returned internally, as the Lord, a quickening Spirit, the second Adam, 1 Cor. xv. 45. the law of the spirit of life, to free [his receivers] from the law of sin and death. Rom. viii. 2. This discourse of Christ is another proof, that Jesus was "made under the law" an outward covenant, *to terminate a shadowy dispensation*, and introduce his new testament, new covenant, kingdom or gospel administration of the Spirit. These things prove, that the doctrine of *completed* Universal salvation, by the external advent of 'God manifest in the flesh,' is necessarily incorrect, and *wofully* misapprehended by its adherents.

10th. The Editor continues his interrogations, and requests *decsription* (I suppose he means *demonstration*) that the *new covenant* spoken of by Isaiah is the *light*, that enlightens every man's conscience; and that this [light or] seed is the kingdom, and that this *seed* is Christ.

Ans. The Lord (Isa. xlii. 1.) speaks of his *elect*, who is the *Messiah;* and in verse 6, says,—"I will *keep thee*, and *give thee* for a *covenant* of the people, for a *light* to the Gentiles, to open the blind eyes, &c. Luke confirms this, [chap. ii. 32] and testifies, that Christ Jesus is the *light*, and good old Simeon *saw* it in the spirit of prophecy, and prophesied. John chap. i. declares, this *light* enlightens every man that cometh into the world. This truth is supported by Isa. xlix. 6. "I will give thee for a *light* to the Gentiles, that *thou* [as a light to be believed in and obeyed] *mayest* be my salvation to the ends of the earth." Isa. xl. 3. says, "The Gentiles shall come to thy light," &c. I will give *thee* for a *covenant*, &c. Isa. xlix. 8. This is evidently not spoken of the first and *outward* coming, but Christ's *internal* coming; for the new covenant is *internal*. Heb. viii. 10. The old covenant and atonement were external.

THEOPHILUS.

(*To be continued.*)

ANSWER.

Theophilus in his *eighth* paragraph, says, "This kingdom, [the gospel, or Spirit,] commenced when "the partition wall between Jew and Gentile was broken down." And his directions to his disciples, was "to preach, not that his kingdom, or dispensation of the Spirit was yet come," &c. Now, read *his* declaration, in proof that the coming of Christ did *not* save *all men*,—"and Jesus confirmed this doctrine, by saying, he was sent, *only* to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*." Compare these declarations with the following,—"Christ was *not* a Mediator of the *old* testament, he is the Mediator of the *new*," &c. Now, again read Theophilus' declaration, in his *fifth* paragraph,—"The *redemption* performed by Jesus in his outward coming, was the *salvation of the Jews* from an *outward covenant*,

law, &c." Reader, the apostle declared, " We have seen, and do testify, that God *sent his Son* to be the *Saviour of the world!*" Theophilus is a very accommodating controversialist; he does not give us the trouble to *confute* him,—he is so *obliging* he does it *himself!!!*

Theophilus commences his *ninth* paragraph thus, " Jesus told his disciples it was expedient that he should go away, as to his outward presence, *to end the law*, and the sins against the law, by the sacrifice of himself:" Now we say, that Jesus said no such thing! In proof, we give Theophilus' own quotation,---"It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter, &c. will not come." The reader will compare the declaration of Christ and Theophilus, and supersede the necessity of further comment. The Comforter, or Spirit of truth, Theophilus speaks of, testifies of Christ,—we presume John was influenced by this Spirit, when he said, " We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the *Saviour of the world*." This Comforter, or Spirit, Christ said, " should reprove the world of *sin*, because they *believed* not on *him*." We ask Theophilus, would this Spirit reprove the *world* of the *sin* of *unbelief*, if the world *believed* the *testimony* of John? Namely, that " the Father sent the Son to be the *Saviour of the world*?" And the declaration of Christ,—"I have *finished the work* thou gavest *me to do*?" Will Theophilus presume to answer this in the *affirmative*? If he does, he *denies* the positive testimony of Christ and his apostles! If he answers in the negative, we give him joy,—we must congratulate him on *admitting* the truth,—the salvation of the *world*,—and saved too, by the *first* coming of Christ in the *flesh!* We inform Theophilus, the reason that Felix *trembled*, was, because he was an *unbeliever*,—the Scriptures declare, that "*faith* works by *love*;" and that perfect *love* casteth out *fear!*" Had Felix believed that Christ was the 'Saviour of the world,' he would have *rejoiced*, not *feared*; for his *own* salvation would have followed of necessity.

Theophilus in his *ninth* paragraph, likewise says, of Christ, after his going away, that he " returned *internally* as the Lord, a quickening Spirit, the *second Adam*, (1 Cor. xv. 45.) the law of the Spirit of life, to free (*his receivers*) from the law of sin and death." Rom. viii. 2. Here again has Theophilus *refuted* himself. In this very paragraph, Theophilus declares, that Christ " *went away* as to his outward presence, *to end the law*, and the *sins* against the law,"—Now, he says, " Christ *returned* internally as the Lord, a quickening Spirit, &c., to *free his receivers* from the *law of sin and death!*" It seems Theophilus was not quite positive that the *first* coming of Christ *freed* men from the *law* and from *sin*,—for he makes Christ do it *over again!* Theophilus in his *confusion*, quotes 1 Cor. xv. 45. and this proves as clear as the noonday sun, that he is in an error of the grossest kind. Please to read the *connexion* to the passage you have quoted, to the conclusion of the chapter; you will find by recurring to the 52d verse, the *time* of the *coming* of Christ,—the 50th verse declares, " that flesh and blood *cannot* inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth *corruption* inherit incorruption,—51st, Behold, I show you a mystery; We shall not *all* sleep, but (what? *Ans.*) we shall *all be changed!*" We ask Theophilus, Do you *believe*, 'we shall *all be changed*?' And if so,—Do you believe the *change* shall be from *corruption* to *incorruption*, and from *mortality* to *immortality*? If so, we again congratulate you! See 53d verse.

We request the attention of Theophilus, to his quotation from Rom. viii. 2. " For the law of the Spirit of life IN *Christ Jesus* (not in *me*) hath made *me free* from the law of *sin* and death." Please to look at the *connexion*, Theophilus? It reads thus,—"For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of *sinful flesh*, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." We ask Theophilus, to consider his own remarks relative to the *law*, and the *Spirit*,—compare the 18th to 25th verses inclusive of this chap. with 1 Cor. xv. 45 to 56 verses. You *will* please to notice, that in Rom. viii. the word *creature* in 20th, 21st, and the words *whole creation*, in the 22d verses, are of the same *extensive* import. We ask Theophilus,—see 20th verse, Was the " *whole creation* made subject to vanity, &c. (or sin in the flesh,) and subjected in hope?" If so,—will they not be *delivered*, when Paul in the 24th verse declares, " For we are *saved by hope*:" and explains,—" but hope that is *seen* is not *hope*," &c. And by John, who says, " We have *seen* and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the *Saviour of the world*? Is it not the *salvation* of the *world* by Christ, which they do *not see*? And will not they be *saved*, who " shall be delivered from the bondage of *corruption* into the *glorious liberty* of the children of God?" Will not this deliverance take place at the *time* mentioned by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 49th to 53d verses inclusive? And is that *time*, the *coming* you contend for in the flesh, the corruptible body in this natural life? You, Theophilus, and Paul, *disagree* widely,—examine whether you are in the *faith*,—not of *Barclay*,—but of *Christ!!!*

" These things [says Theophilus] prove that the doctrine of *completed* Universal salvation, by the *external* advent of 'God manifest in the flesh,' is *necessarily incorrect*, and *wofully* misapprehended by its adherents." Reader, we appeal to you! What do you think 'these things *prove*?' Christ, when he came in his *external advent*, declared, that he " *came to save the world*,"—but Theophilus declared, that he came to *end the law!* Now we believe Christ; and are quite willing to '*wofully* misapprehend' the *crooked* notions of Barclay and Miss Guion, &c., which appear to be the 'man of Theophilus' counsel.' If this is objected to, we reply, the Scriptures quoted afford him no evidence,—nay more,—they condemn his hypothesis altogether!

Theophilus in his paragraph, number 10, says, " The Editor continues his interrogations, and requests *description* [I suppose he means *demonstration*] that the *new covenant* spoken of by Isaiah is the *light*, that enlighteneth every man's conscience; and that this (light or) seed is the kingdom, and that this seed is Christ." Now we are not offended, but we feel deep regret on witnessing this *perversion* of our answer to Theophilus, see Number 19, page 75, at the conclusion of the 3d column, where we interrogated Theophilus thus,---" We ask Theophilus, where he obtained his authority for calling Christ the flesh; and *describing him* [Christ] as made under the outward covenant to end a shadowy dispensation? And to *describe the new covenant*, which Isaiah speaks of, to be nothing more than a light in every man's conscience; and to declare, that *this* is the *seed* of the kingdom, and that this *seed* is *Christ*?" Reader, suppose this were admitted, on what ground would Theophilus stand? Recollect, he says Christ is a *light in every man's conscience*. Now, every man is *all* men; and he quotes Isaiah xlii. 1, 6. " I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, &c., and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles." Isaiah xlix, 6. " I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth," Isaiah xl. 3. And he adds, " This is evidently *not* spoken of the *first* and outward coming, &c." We request Theophilus to compare Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, 3. " The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives," &c. Compare this with your quotation in Isaiah xlii. 6, 7. and with Luke ii. 20. of Simeon's declaration, " For mine eyes have seen thy *salvation*," and with Luke iv. 16, to 21st verses. The 21st verse declares, " This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." Now read the declaration of Theophilus,—" This is evidently *not spoken* of the *first* and outward coming," &c. Christ said " *this day*,"---What day? *Ans.* The *day* when Christ in his *first* coming read the prophecy in question! Simeon said, " mine eyes have seen thy *salvation!*" Not mine eyes have seen a " *light in every man's conscience*." Theophilus then quotes Heb. viii. 10. The concluding words of *this* covenant are, " For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." The 6th verse informs us, that Christ is the *Mediator* of this *covenant*, and that it " was established upon *better promises*." What were the *first* promises? Ans. " Do this and live." Reader, this is Theophilus' *covenant!!!* And although he says, the *first covenant* or law is *ended*; he still contends for its *penalties*, and promises nothing, except on obedience to its commands. We request him to read on,—look at the next, the ix. and the following, x. chap. " Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his *own blood*, he entered in *once* into the holy place, having [in the past tense] obtained eternal redemption *for us*. For by ONE *offering* he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Reader, now look at Theophilus' declaration,---"This is evidently *not* spoken of the *first* and outward *coming* of Christ," &c. Reader, if you have the smallest doubt remaining, relative to the falsity of Theophilus' doctrine, that the salvation of men *depends* upon, and is *effected* by, the *second coming* of Christ, and that his *first* coming effected NOTHING! read what follows,---Heb. x. 12, 13, 14. " But this man, *after he had offered one* sacrifice for sins, *for ever sat down* on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting [will he be disappointed?] till his enemies be made his footstool. *For* by *one* offering he hath perfected *for ever* them that are sanctified!"

Quere. Is the 'Christ in every man's conscience,' the Christ who *sat down* on the right hand of God? And will those who are *perfected and sanctified*, be made miserable without end?

(To be continued.)

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

In looking over No. 28 of the Gospel Herald, in my communication, I find a mistake; whether unintentional or otherwise, I wish to have it corrected. The subject on which I am concerned to treat is of too much importance to be lightly treated, or turned into ridicule. The words " darkness covers the face of the mighty *deep*," being altered to the " mighty *dupe*," render the sense ridiculous. But I will allow such a mistake might have happened unintentionally, from the make of the *ee's* appearing like a *u*.

Please to notice this mistake in the next Number, and oblige,

AN IMPARTIALIST.

ANSWER.

In the communication, the word printed *dupe* was legibly written *dupe*, not *deep*. Our impression at the time was, that the writer considered the *infidel* to be a *dupe* to his *folly*, and that *darkness*, or error, as a consequence, covered his *face*. The circumstances were such as to make any apology on our part unnecessary; and this ought in justice to be considered as perfectly gratuitous.

To Correspondents.

The many communications on hand, makes it necessary for our correspondents, whose *favours* are for the present withheld from the public, to exercise their patience. They shall be published in the order they were received.

It has been necessary to omit for the present, the *Exposition* of Luke xvi. As soon, however, as the communications on hand will admit, it will be resumed.

*** Mentor, and J. C. in answer to Pothos' genealogical question, are received, and will be published in their turn.

All communications forwarded the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be " post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

Errata.

In Number 28, p. 115, 1 Col. 39 line from the top, for *dupe*, read *deep*.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

" FEAR NOT ; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1820. NO. 31.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Answer to the Sincere Inquirer.

(Concluded.)

In Gal. iii. 16. Paul affirms, that *Christ* [the light] is the *seed*, and *Christ* (who is the *word* to be ingrafted, James i.) calls the *good seed* sown by the Divine sower the *word of the kingdom*, Matt. xiii. Peter says, We heard the *voice* [or *word*] that came from heaven while we were with Christ Jesus in the holy mount, where he was transfigured; but he adds, " We have also a more *sure word* of prophecy [than that *voice* from heaven] whereunto ye do *well* to take heed, as unto a *light* that shineth in a *dark place*, [*the corrupt heart*] until the day dawn, and the *day-star* [or *Sun of Righteousness*] arise in your hearts," 2 Pet. i. 19. Jesus Christ is the *true light*, enlightening every man, John i. 9. and is the true gospel minister and teacher. John says, 1 John ii. 27. "The *anointing* which *ye have received*, abideth in you, and ye need not that any man *teach* you: but as the same *anointing* teacheth you of all things and is *truth*." Whoever has received this *anointing*, or *unction* from the Holy One, and has it abiding in him and he abiding in it, has Jesus Christ the truth, " the hope of Israel, the Saviour." Jer. xiv. 8. He has him in his *spiritual advent;* and according to Jude i. 14. he has thus *come a second time without sin unto salvation*, " *in ten thousand of his saints*." " Of which salvation, [says Peter] the prophets have inquired and searched diligently," who prophesied of the *grace* that should come, 1 Pet. i. This " *grace* of God, that *bringeth* [not *brought*] *salvation*, hath appeared [and does still appear] to all men," [as the light of salvation] Tit. ii. 11. and is Christ the *seed*, *word*, and *light*, enlightening every man to save him. Hence it is manifest, that this grace, light, covenant, or Christ, (the only Saviour,) is near, even at the door of the hearts of free-agents; and at times, and seasons, it knocks for entrance, that the door may be opened, that he may enter, and bind the strong man armed, cast him out, spoil his goods, sup with and *save* their souls. But if they will not have this man, Jesus Christ, the power of God, to rule over them, and if they break his covenant, " of how much sorer punishment shall they be thought worthy, who have trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the *blood* of the covenant an unholy thing?" Heb. x. 29. As the new covenant is spiritual, the *blood* of it is also spiritual; and no other blood can cleanse us. For as the Son is the *true light*, and new covenant; and as no man knoweth the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealeth him," [that is, no man knoweth the Father but by the revelation of the Son or light,] and as the forgiveness of sins is only as we walk in the light, (" for if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the *blood* of Jesus Christ [the bread that came down from heaven, John vi. 33] *cleanseth* us from all sin; 1 John i. so it consequently follows, that they who do not walk in the light, and who talk lightly of the light, are out of the true Christian fellowship and " *unity of the Spirit;*" which " *is the bond of peace* " They are not, *in fact*, cleansed from sin by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. They are only cleansed *in notion;* not understanding the Scriptures, nor the power of God, by which it is done. They are blind, and naked, and know not which way they are going to judgment; being out of the true way, Jesus Christ, the light, in and by which only salvation is obtainable.

Doubtless that spirit which is out of God, will make all possible exertion, by its recipients, to blind the children of men and sow pillows under their arm-holes, Ezek. xiii. 16, 18. and cry, peace, peace, to the wicked; promising him life, v. 22. and say you *were all saved*, when the law, and sins against it, were ended; consequently, salvation from sin and victory over the world, *are now* unnecessary to salvation. But the prophet saith expressly,—" There is no peace to the wicked, saith my God." And this God still saith to every individual, when his Spirit reproves them for sin " And if ye die in your sins (said Christ) where I am ye cannot come." Christ is the new covenant, and an offered salvation for all, before the face of all people. This offering or inestimable gift may be refused, Prov. i. 24. Rev. xxi. The covenant of light and life, that is offered for salvation, becomes when rejected the condemner of its enemies. " For this is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, but men love darkness [evil] rather than light, because their deeds are evil. Those who bring their deeds to this light, who walk in it, and love to obey it, become the children of it, and it is their salvation.

Having answered the Editor, I request that he will do justice to his correspondents by treating them, as he would like to be treated on a change of circumstances. What I have written to the Sincere Inquirer after Truth, was so concordant to the express declarations of Scripture, that I did not expect that my assertions would have been stigmatized with such opprobrious accusations, as impious, or absurd, or deistical, or ridiculous, &c. It was naturally to have been expected, that the Inquirer would have replied, and I should have been pleased to have heard from him. But if the Editor shall continue to answer in the style with which he has commenced, he should not expect it will be pleasing or gratifying to persons who are lovers of peace, piety and truth. As I do not love controversy, and as I have too little time to devote to it, I hope that the public will excuse me, if I should make no rejoinder to what may hereafter appear against this, my defence, and reply to his questions, which you have now before you.

Please to take particular notice of the *outward* redemption *from under the law*, and of the *internal saving atonement*, and *sanctification*, *propitiation*, and *purification*. 1. I say *internal saving atonement*, because I John says, conditionally and in the present tense, " If we walk in the *light*, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood [Spirit] of Jesus Christ *cleanseth* [does now atone,—not *did cleanse*] *us* from all sin." 2d. I said, *sanctification*, because 1 Peter says, (chap. i. 2.) we become elect, " through *sanctification* and sprinkling of the blood [i. e. life] of Jesus;" for this " sprinkles the heart from an evil conscience." Heb. x. 22. 3d. I said *propitiation*, because 1 John ii. 1. says, " If any man sin, we have an *advocate* with the Father, [*Paracleton*] Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is a *propitiation* for *our* sins, and not for *ours* only, [when *we*, meaning the apostle and good people to whom he wrote, fall into sins, and require renewed propitiation] but for the sins of the whole world;" [which is unregenerated, yet may be redeemed " by the Spirit of our God" as were the first Christians, see 1 Cor. vi. 9 to 11] 4th I said *purification;* because 1 Pet. i. 22. says, " Ye have purified your souls in *obeying* the truth *through the Spirit*, unto unfeigned love of the brethren; consequently we also should *purify our souls* through the Spirit and obedience to the truth. In the new covenant we are " not redeemed with *corruptible* things, but with the *incorruptible* precious blood of Christ;" the blood of bulls and goats, rams, silver and gold, are corruptible things, and cannot redeem from corruption, but the blood of Christ (which is the life) " sprinkled on the hearts" and consciences of his people, enables them " *to serve the living God in newness of life.*" The blood of the old covenant, was the *life* of beasts. Gen. ix. 4. The blood of the New Testament is the life of Christ; the Lamb without spot or blemish, who saith, Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,* ye have no life in you. If any have life they must feel their hearts sprinkled with the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. This blood of Jesus Christ *cleanses from all sin*, because it is the life of Christ, in which we are to live and walk [to get cleansed.] In the new covenant, the bodies of believers are temples and tabernacles of God, and Christ the High Priest dwells and walks with them. These distinctions of the two covenants and atonements are essential. I now submit to the Sincere Inquirer, and my candid readers, to decide between the Editor and myself. But in judging, I hope you will set your faces against unjust accusations, sophistry, sarcasm, boasting and ridicule, that may appear on either side.

With good will to the Editor and all my readers, I subscribe, THEOPHILUS.

ANSWER.

Theophilus has quoted a sufficient number of passages from the Scriptures to explain, or prove, provided explanation or proof were possible; but unfortunately for him, *his* doctrine came from *another* source, and the Scriptures will not support him.—Theophilus, with a view to support his hypothesis, quotes Gal. iii. 16. Matt. xiii. We inform him, that we believe Christ is the *seed*, being the *seed* of the *woman* who should bruise the *serpent's* head. The quotation from Gal. reads thus—' Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. It saith not and to *seeds*, as of many; but as of *one*, And to thy seed, which is *Christ*.' We now ask, What was that *promise*? Ans. ' In thy seed (Christ) shall all the families of the earth be blessed.' Again, ' Ask of me, and I shall give the heathen thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth thy possession.' Psalm ii. 8. Again, ' All things were made by him and for him.' The parable of the *wheat* and the *tares*, see Matt. xiii. ' The good seed are the children of the kingdom.' Now all things were made *by*, and *for* Christ; consequently, all that Christ made were *good seed*. Did the devil, who sowed the *tares*, ever create one of the human race? The *wheat* came from *Christ*—the *tares* from the *devil*—and the sooner the devil gets his own the better! With this explanation, Theophilus may carry all the *seed*, and the seed *only* to heaven—the *tares* have no business there. Theophilus quotes and *alters* the declaration of Peter, i. 19. The reader by examining the chapter, will find, that Peter does not say, that he has a ' *more sure* word of prophecy ' than *that voice from heaven*.' Peter said, ' there came such a voice to him (Christ) from the *excellent glory*.' Reader, Theophilus is of opinion that the ' voice from *heaven*, from the excellent glory,' was not *quite sure*, for Peter had something ' *more* sure!' We pity the man, whose blindness and prejudices lead him so far astray, as to doubt, even the stability of the ' excellent glory of heaven' itself! Theophilus says, of Christ, that he ' is the true gospel Minister, and teacher.' Now, Christ taught nearly 1800 years ago; that he came to *save* the world; and that he *finished* the *work* he came to do! Does Theophilus believe this teaching? We fear not. Theophilus says, ' Whosoever has received the *anointing* or *unction* from the Holy One, &c. has Jesus Christ the truth.' The Scriptures declare, that Jesus Christ suffered on the Cross, &c. and ' ascended into heaven, and that the heaven *must receive* (retain) him, until the restitution of all things,' &c. But Theophilus says, of Christ, that 'according to Jude i. 14. *he* has thus come a *second* time *without* sin unto salvation *in* ten thousand of his *saints*.' Let Jude speak for himself—' verse 14. 15. ' And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh *with* (not *in*) ten thousand of his saints, to

* This be said in the present tense; his *flesh* and *blood* therefore, was then, and now is, his Spirit, which they who had life in them partook of.

execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly,' &c. Quere. Are the ungodly now 'convinced of *all* their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed?' We think the communication of Theophilus, alone, is a sufficient proof that this is yet future!

Theophilus, speaking of the 'grace that should come,' alludes to 1 Peter i. and says, 'This grace of God that *bringeth* (not *brought*) *salvation*, hath appeared (and does still appear) to *all* men (as the light of salvation) Titus ii. 11. and is Christ the seed, &c. enlightening every man to save him,' &c. Let us examine this—'*bringeth*—not *brought* salvation,' says Theophilus,—Quere. Is not this *miserable sophistry*? Theophilus *bringeth* his communication to be published—we must *not* say it *was* (in the past tense) *brought*—Why? Ans. because Theophilus *bringeth* IT!!! Will Theophilus call this *levity*, and *ridicule*? We mean it for argument, and think it will answer the purpose intended. Let Paul speak for himself—see Epistle to Titus, ii. 11. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation *to all men* hath appeared. (Quere. Could it appear before it was *brought*?) Teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, &c. *looking* for that blessed hope, (how is this Theophilus?) and the glorious *appearing* (Now, Theophilus, apply your logic—"*bringeth*, not brought!") of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Quere. Would his appearing be *glorious*, if he is to consign millions to never ending *misery*? And could he in that case be truly called "*our Saviour*?" We think *not!* Again, hear the testimony of Paul, relative to the *first* coming of Christ. The testimony last quoted, refers to Christ's coming in future, "a glorious appearing *without* sin," &c. ii. Timothy i. 9. "Who hath (in the past tense) *saved* us," &c. See 10th verse, "But is now made manifest (How) by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death," &c. We now ask, What is made manifest? Let Paul answer,—"who hath *saved* us," &c. IT IS DONE! Should Theophilus object to our quotation from Paul's Epistle to Titus, ii. 11. we inform him, that the *translation* of that *verse*, is neither consistent with *truth*, nor the original. Has the *grace* of God *appeared* to *all men*; or had *it* at the *time* Paul made the declaration? No! There were, and are at this day, millions, to whom it has *never appeared!*

Theophilus concludes this paragraph, after speaking of the "blood of Christ being spiritual, and cleansing from all sin those who walk in the light," &c. says, "So it consequently follows, that they who do *not walk in the light*, &c. are *not*, in fact, *cleansed* from all sin." What is the *light*? Ans. *truth!* Is it *true* that the "*blood* of Jesus *cleanseth* from *all* sin?" If so, a man who *walks in* this *light*, or *believes* that the *blood* of Jesus *cleanseth him* from all *sin*, and believes this on the testimony of Christ, who declared, see John vi. 51. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." If any man believes this, he "*walks* in the *light*,"—his believing does not make it *true*—if it is not truth *before* he believes it, there is no *light* for him to walk *in!* But there is truth, and light, and knowledge. "My people (says God) perish for lack of knowledge." If they had knowledge of this fact, that they are *saved*, are *cleansed* by the blood of Christ, they would not perish.—Theophilus adds, "They (that is, we presume, those who believe in Christ) are only cleansed *in notion!*" It seems, then, that their *notions* are *cleansed*.—Reader, mark well the reason he assigns. "Not understanding the Scriptures, nor the *power of God*, by which it is done," &c. Now we think we understand the *power* of God; and understand it to be able to *save all men!*

Theophilus commences his next paragraph, saying, "Doubtless the spirit which is out of God, will make all possible exertion by its recipients, to blind the children of men, and sow pillows under their arm-holes, Ezek. xiii. 16. 18." The Reader is requested to turn to this chap and read to the end. The 16th verse *was* applicable to Jerusalem, before its destruction. The 18th reads thus—"Thus saith the Lord God, Wo to the *women* that sow pillows to all arm-holes," &c. This reproof to the *female* pride of attire, *was* applicable at the *time* it was spoken. The 22d verse of this Chap. reads thus—"Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." It is unnecessary to remark farther, than to observe, the Scriptures declare, that "God is the Saviour of all men," consequently, this *cannot* be the *lie* alluded to. Now we think, the heart of the truly righteous would be *sad indeed*, if he thought any of his *brethren* of Adam's race would be for ever miserable. We likewise think, no righteous man would strengthen the hands of the *wicked* unbeliever in the salvation of God for a lost world, by encouraging him to expect salvation by his own wicked works, and thereby prevent him from turning to the "Saviour of all men," and accepting the cup of salvation "without money, and without price!" Theophilus adds, "And cry, peace, peace, to the wicked, promising him life, and say, you *were all saved* when the *law*, and the *sins* against it were *ended*; consequently, salvation from *sin* and victory over the world, are *now unnecessary* to *salvation*." If Theophilus will look again at the xiii. Ezek. he will read of those, who "daubed with untempered mortar," consequently, their wall *fell* down, &c. We think Theophilus is daubing with *untempered* mortar, and that his *wall* will *fall* of consequence. The Scriptures say, and we say, that "by *grace* are ye *saved*, through faith, and *that* not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. *Not* of *works*, lest any man should boast. God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Of Christ, that "having made peace by the blood of his cross, by *him* (not by our works or faith) to reconcile all things unto himself; by him *I say*, whether *they be* things on earth, or things in heaven." To unbelieving wicked men, we cry no *peace*; for although the *peace* is *made*, they will *not believe it*, and "tribulation and anguish shall be upon every soul of man that doeth evil! But God, who is rich in mercy, for his *great love* wherewith *he loved* us, *even* when we were *dead* in *sins*, hath (in the past tense) quickened us together with Christ,(by grace are ye saved:)and hath raised *us* up together, and made us *sit together* in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus." Ephes. iii. 4. 5. 6. And all this, Theophilus, when there was *no peace* in the mind of the *wicked*, and while he was *dead in sin*. Do you believe it? If so, you believe there is *peace* in Christ when there is *war* in the mind of the *wicked*; and if you preach *peace* on any *other* plan, than the *salvation* wrought out and *effected by Christ*, when the Father sent him to *save* the world, *you* cry peace, peace, when there is *no peace!* "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness, but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God, and wisdom of God." i. Corinthians i. 23, 24.

Theophilus in his answer, &c. observes, "And this God still saith to every individual when his Spirit reproves them for sin, and "If ye die in your sins (said Christ) where I am ye cannot come."—Theophilus will recollect, this was addressed to the Jews, who crucified Christ. Paul said of these Jews, that "God concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." It was because of unbelief, they could not go to Christ.—Christ told his immediate disciples, "Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, *ye cannot* come; so say *I unto you*." Shall not those Jews that died in their sins come to Christ? See Mat. xxiii. 37. 38. 39. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, &c. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, *Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord*." This time will come; and they will see, and bless God their Saviour, and be blessed in the knowledge of him. Again—Christ said, "No man *can come* to me, except the Father draw him." And the prophet declares, "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn (repent) unto the Lord," &c. Theophilus adds, "The covenant of life and light, that is offered *for* salvation, becomes, when rejected, the condemner of its enemies," &c. We inform Theophilus, that instead of something being offered *for* salvation, that *salvation* itself is not only *offered*, but secured *in* Christ for the *whole world!* Proof—Rom. v. 6. 8. 9. 10. "In due time Christ died (in the past tense) for the ungodly. God commendeth his love towards us, (How? Ans.) in that while *we* were yet *sinners* Christ *died* for *us*. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall (in future tense) be saved *from* wrath (by our goodness?—No!) through him. (What evidence have you for this, Paul? Ans.) For if when we *were enemies*, we *were* (in the past tense) *reconciled* to God by the death of his Son, *much more*, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." We ask Theophilus, do you believe this? Can you consistently with *your* doctrine, admit, that men, even when they *are*, and *were* ENEMIES, were, and are reconciled to God, *in*, and by Christ? Rom. vi. 5. 6. "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of *his* resurrection.—Knowing this, (What? Reader, mark well what follows,) that our old man is crucified with *him*," &c. See, likewise, Rom. xiv. 7. 8. 9. 10. Again—God speaking by his prophet, says, "Return unto me, for I (not your works—I) *have* redeemed you."—Not, I *will*, in the *future* tense, redeem you, if you will comply with certain conditions! The work is done! you are saved! "What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits towards me? I will *take* (accept) the cup of Salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord,"—not refuse it, until I have, what my *vanity* may persuade me is an equivalent. We offer Theophilus one testimony more, and request him to prove, that those that are *perfected* are in *danger* of endless misery; or confess, that perfection is a *state* of purity, equal to *his own* personal purity, and rather superior! Heb. x. 14. "For by *one* offering he hath (in the *past* tense) perfected for ever them that are sanctified." We conclude our remarks on this paragraph, with *its* concluding sentence. "Those who bring their deeds to this light, who walk in it, and love and obey it, become the children of it, *and it is their salvation*."

Theophilus commences his next paragraph, thus, "Having answered the Editor, I request that he will do justice to his correspondents, by treating them as he would like to be treated on a *change* of circumstances." What does Theophilus mean by "*change of circumstances?*" Were he the Editor of the Herald, it would afford him no advantage of reply, nor open no new source of argument, which is not *now* at his command. We know of no other circumstance, except a change of principle, on his part, proceeding from a knowledge and belief of the *truth*, which we acknowledge would afford advantages, far superior to what he *now* possesses. If we are in an *error*, an *exposition* of that *error*, couch it in any language you please, will be received with gratitude. We respect Theophilus—we respect all men. In the language of the apostle, we declare, "God hath taught us, that we should call no man common, nor unclean." It is not the *man*, Theophilus, but the *errors* and *absurdities* that the man *Theophilus* advocates and cherishes, that we "call *common* and *unclean!*" We are not only willing to grant, but we cheerfully confess, that Theophilus may be actuated by a motive *sincere*, as *ardent*; and that he is really *afflicted*, and considers the doctrine he opposes as subversive of the best interests of mankind; and that he has associated in his efforts to refute it, feelings, which would be honourable to any man, let his principles or sect be what they may. Nay more, we acknowledge, that we have opposed the truth ourselves, and have uttered as great *absurdities*, have made use of arguments quite as *ridiculous*, drawn deductions pregnant with equal *impiety*, and advanced principles which savoured of as absolute *deism*,—as ever Theophilus has done! In short, we make no pretensions; for we have none—we acknowledge ourselves to *be* the *chief* of sinners; and if it will afford any satisfaction to our correspondents, we have no objections to acknowledge, that we *have been* the chief of *fools!* For of all *follies* that ever disgraced human nature, that of opposing our *opinions*, and *wills*, to the *oath*, declaration, and WILL of JEHOVAH, is the *greatest!!!*

Theophilus' last paragraph commences with the

following requests,—"Please to take particular notice of the *outward* redemption from under the law, and of the *internal saving atonement, sanctification, propitiation*, and *purification*. First,—I say *internal* saving atonement, because, 1 John i. 7. says, "If we walk in the *light*, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood (Spirit) of Jesus Christ *cleanseth* (does *now* atone,—not, *did* cleanse) *us* from all sin." Here is a reason assigned, why salvation is *conditional*. We request Theophilus to read the whole chapter,—the reason why we say salvation is *not* conditional, is, that John says, the things "he has seen and heard he declares," &c. Now, *what* does John declare, and *why* does he declare it? Ans. verse 5. 6. "This, then, is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that *God is light*, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in *darkness*, we lie, and do not the truth." Now what is it to "*walk in darkness?*" Let John answer, ii. 11. "But he that *hateth* his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness," &c. You will notice, that the words *darkness*, and *lie*, and *light*, and *truth*, are convertible terms. John says, see chap. i. 8. "If we say we have *no sin*, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." See 24. 25 verses, chap. ii. "Let *that* abide in you, which ye have heard," &c. What is it? Ans. "The *promise*, that he hath promised us, *eternal life*." Now read chap. v. 10, 11. "He that believeth *not* God hath made him a *liar*, *because* he believeth not the *record* that God *gave* of his *Son*, and this is the *record*, that *we have* eternal life, and this life is *in his Son*." See verse 20. "We are *in* him that is *true*, *in* his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." Who is the *true* God? Ans. Jesus Christ. What is *eternal life?* To be IN *him*, the *true* God, or *Jesus Christ!* Who is *in* Christ? Ans. *All men!* Proof. See chap. v. 10, 11. Do you object to this? Then answer,—Is not the *unbeliever*, one who "*walks in darkness?*" Has he eternal life *in* Christ? If you answer no! How can it be said he *gives* God the *lie?* If what he disbelieves is *truth*, then you admit the *unbeliever* has *eternal life* treasured up for him *in* Christ. Now look at your objection. "John says *conditionally*, and in the *present* tense, *if* we walk," &c. Look again at chap. v. 11. "This is the record, that God hath given to *us* eternal life, and this life is *in* his Son." Read 12th verse, "He that hath the *Son* hath *life*; (i. e. he that *believeth* on the Son, or *walks* in the *light*, "hath life;" or experiences the joys of this eternal life, salvation) he that hath *not* the *Son* of God (i. e. he that believeth *not* the record, and giveth God the lie, by *denying* the *truth*) hath *not* life." Now, again consider your objection. See chap. i. 7. "But if we walk in the light, (believe the truth) as he is in the light, (believe the truth as it is *in* God, and agreeable to his promise in the beginning, in Eden, to Abraham, &c. Gen. iii. 15. xxii. 16, 17, 18.) we have fellowship one with another, (we do not in that case, say, "Stand by, &c." I go to heaven,—my *wicked* neighbour to hell-fire,) and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." John says, "These things write I unto you, that your *joy* may be *full*." Again, "My little children (because young in the faith) these things write I unto you, that ye sin *not*." What things? *Universal Salvation!* What! Write, publish, and proclaim this *licentious* doctrine, to *prevent men* from sinning? It cannot be But it is so, for John adds, chap. ii. "And if *any* man sin (no matter who he is, whether he goes to *our church* or not,) *we* have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; (ah, *we*,—John says, if *we sin*, good men; he does not say, if *sinners* sin, *hear* him out,) And he is the propitiation for *our* sins,(there,—for *our* sins,—for those that "*walk* in the *light*," "conditionally," for *good* men) and *not* for ours *only* (well, well, but John means, for other *good men* at a future time? Does he? Let *him* speak for himself) but *also* for the WHOLE WORLD." Now Theophilus, Where is your condition? *Tie it* on if you can!

Theophilus continues,—"*Secondly*,—I said *sanctification*, because 1 Peter i 2. says, we become elect, "through *sanctification* and sprinkling of the blood [life] of Jesus," for this 'sprinkles the heart from an evil conscience,' Heb. x. 22. Now, we consider the *sanctification* mentioned, to be a knowledge in the believer, that Christ has "purged his sins" and perfected him. We are sorry Theophilus did not look at the next, the 3d verse. "Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which (who) *according* to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." Please to look at the word *according* in the 3d verse, it is declarative of the *cause*, which was the *abundant mercy*, &c.,---look at the 2d verse again. You, Theophilus, say, "we become *elect* through sanctification, &c. Peter says, "*elect according* to the *foreknowledge* of God." We think Theophilus' attempt to *fasten* on a *condition* here, has failed altogether!

Theophilus remarks, "Thirdly, I said *propitiation*, because 1 John ii. 1. says, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, *(Paracleton)* Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only [when *we*, meaning the apostle and *good* people to whom he wrote, fall into sins, and require *renewed* propitiation] but for the sins of the whole world;" [which is unregenerated, yet *may* be redeemed "by the *Spirit of our God*," as were the first Christians.] See 1 Cor. vi. 9 to 11. Now we consider this, like all attempts to reason away the truth, pityful and weak to the last extreme. We see nothing in the quotation from 1 Cor. &c., which can support Theophilus. Read the whole chapter, compare the 7th and 8th with the 9th verse, and these with the 20th. He is for having every thing *future*, except the personal purity of *we*. We dismiss this modern logic, with the request, that Theophilus would allow Paul to know as much as himself; and Paul testified, see Heb. ix. 12. speaking of Christ, "By his own blood he entered (in the past tense) in *once* into the holy place, having [in the past tense] obtained eternal *redemption*," &c.

Theophilus' *last* section, is introduced thus,---"Fourthly, I said *purification*, because 1 Peter i. 22. says, "Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth," &c. Now we request the reader to take his Bible, and with us examine the doctrine and preaching of Peter. In the 1st chap. 3d verse, Peter blesses God, &c., who hath begotten us again unto a *lively hope*---What do those thus begotten *hope* for? Ans. Salvation. What evidence is this hope, or expectation grounded upon? Ans. The [knowledge of the] resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. The 4th verse explains, that there is an incorruptible inheritance reserved in heaven for them. The 5th verse says, it is the power of God, (not their own exertions) which keeps them, through the medium of faith unto salvation, or confidence in the promises of God; and that this salvation is to be revealed in the last time. The 6th and 7th verses speak of their rejoicing on account of the trial of their faith, &c. The 8th and 9th verses, speaking of Christ, says, "Whom having *not* seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable," &c. We ask, what did they believe, which caused them to rejoice? Was it that they *themselves* were to be saved, and their wicked neighbours should be miserable for ever, was this the cause of their joy? No! The next, the 9th verse, explains the cause. "Receiving the end of your faith [mark well what follows, 'as a man thinketh, so is he.' If their faith only included themselves, a partial salvation, we think it would read different] the *salvation of souls*" Not *even* the salvation of *your* souls. The words *even*, and *your*, were added by the translators, and perverts the sense of the whole chapter. The next, the 10th verse, is proof of this perversion. "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired, &c., who prophesied," &c. Now, we ask, Did the prophets prophesy of the salvation of the particular, and few persons, whom Peter characterizes, as "strangers, scattered throughout Pontus," &c., in contradistinction to all others? No! They did not What did the prophets prophesy of Christ? Ans. 'On him shall the Gentiles trust;' the nations. 'He shall be my salvation to the ends of the earth' All nations whom God hath made shall worship before him and glorify his name. All the ends of the world shall remember and turn [repent] unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him." The 11th verse *is* remarkable, and declares, it was the Spirit of Christ which signified by the prophets, and testified beforehand his sufferings, and the glory that should follow, &c. See 12th verse. What *glory* should follow? Ans. The salvation of all men! All nations should come and worship,---all the ends of the world should remember, &c. This is triumphant testimony! Well does the apostle add, see 13th verse, "Wherefore, gird up the loins of your mind, (a strong figure,---be firm in your belief,---let nothing trouble you) be sober, and hope to the end [not hope to-day,---to-morrow doubt, and the third day fear!] for the grace (or favour) that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." This is different doctrine, from that of Christ being already revealed in the hearts of men here, and they being pure and holy in themselves, in this life, and while they are in the corruption of flesh and blood.

Peter in the 14, 15, and 16 verses, exhorts to obedience, and holy conversation, &c. In the 17th verse, Peter says, 'And if ye call on the Father (how did Christ direct us to call on the Father? Ans. 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those that trespass against us,') who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning in fear.' How different is this from the orthodoxy of the day? God, says some, hates sinners. Mark the harmony of the Scriptures. The prophet declared, "the Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." Who, or what constitutes the works of God? Ans.—All things were made by him, and for him." He is, therefore, the Universal Father, Friend, and Benefactor! Peter, in the 18, and 19 verses assigns a reason, why they should walk circumspectly. It is worthy of remark, that Peter does not threaten them with eternal damnation and misery, to deter them from doing wrong! No! He persuades them, by telling them of what Christ had done to redeem them. Not what *they* must do to obtain salvation for themselves—he declares, they were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, who was fore-ordained (or appointed) before the foundation of the world, but was manifest, [or made known] in these last times for you. We ask, for whom? Ans. see 20th verse, "Who by him [not by, or of ourselves] believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that your faith and hope might be in God;" not in your own faith, or purity, or any thing that belongs to you. Peter then adds, the 22d verse, which is quoted by Theophilus,—"Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, [how?] unto unfeigned love of the *brethren; love one another* with a pure heart fervently." We now see the nature of the *purification* Peter spoke of, and Theophilus quoted; for Peter adds, 23d verse, Being born again, &c. by the word of God, &c; and in the 24th verse says, 'For all flesh *is* as grass, and all the *glory of man* as the flower of grass," &c. Please to examine this figure. Flesh is compared to grass, and the glory of man to the flower of grass. Now the grass is more lasting than the flower; consequently, the *glory of man* is short-lived indeed! With this striking illustration of the vanity of every thing human, whether dignified with expressions of goodness, purity, or righteousness, we exhort Theophilus to glory in God; for we, says the apostle, "are in Christ, who of God is made unto us Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption, and let him that glorieth glory in the Lord." For, says Peter, see 25th verse, "the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." And this *word*, see John xii. 47, to 50th verses, "is life everlasting." And this gospel, preaching this word to the world, is "Good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people!"—Health to Theophilus—Amen.

Note. We ask Theophilus, if he had quoted Heb. x. 29. correctly, and *not* omitted the words, '*wherewith he was sanctified*,' How would your doctrine have appeared? We think it would have looked very different from the *truth!* Reader, please to examine the passage, and compare it with the quotation 125 page, 1. col. 29th line from bottom.

For the Gospel Herald.

FRIENDLY READERS,—When I took my pen to vindicate the doctrine of conditional salvation, I judged it necessary, first to state my own opinion respecting the same, before I proceeded to controvert the doctrine of unconditional salvation, the avowed sentiment of the Editor. Now, as all Christendom are united in believing that they obtain their salvation *by Jesus* the Saviour, it becomes a grand question, What are they saved from? from their own sins, or those of their primogeniture? Now, as the Editor's doctrine appeared to be founded upon an object possessing unlimited power, despotically exerted to restore us from the fall and guilt of Adam's transgression, and being confident that no such guilt existed, I wished to refute that opinion, and by so doing, I might show, that the Editor's doctrine which is indeed a stumbling block in his way, and mere rubbish to impede the progress of this controversy, founded upon a false position, and if I succeeded in overthrowing the doctrine of hereditary guilt, I was sensible he could not devise means for a Saviour to be applied unto mankind in any other sense, than that of a seed, by which generated Adam is regenerated, or by which mankind are regenerated out of their *first* animal birth, nature, and image, into the incorruptible birth, nature, and image of God.

Agreeable to my promise, I have advanced a few arguments against the doctrine of hereditary guilt, and have carefully examined his last remarks, in No. 26, page 107, and cannot find any thing worthy of attention, (except a little information in the first paragraph, accompanying a beautiful apology to the Society of Friends) he appears to be divested of all his boasted armour in which he dared me to the combat, see No. 19, page 79, not a single argument now appears in these remarks, but declarations without proof, and misconstructions, the last resource of all those that are unwilling to yield when *convinced* that they cannot prove their premises. Pray reader, look at his reply, in his *second* paragraph; "We do neither believe nor advocate the doctrine, that the sin of *Adam* is the sin of his *posterity*; we again reiterate our former declaration. We believe Christ came to *save* his *people* from their sins; and if his *people's* sins, are *Adam's* sins, we believe the Saviour was necessary to restore us from the guilt of *Adam*, and not without." Reader, look at this! I expected that my antagonist would come out in his impenetrable armour, and testify, whether Christ's *people's* sins were *Adam's* sins, or not; seeing it is the ground-work of his religion, that Christ saves all mankind from some sin or other. And further, he has frankly *told me*, he neither believes nor advocates the doctrine, that the sin of *Adam* is the sin of his *posterity*. Here *we are*, both on the *same side* of the question. Amen.

Now, seeing that *we* are not contaminated with the guilt of *Adam's transgression*, how can you devise necessary means for a Saviour unto mankind in any other sense, than that of a seed, by which he is regenerated into the image of God; agreeably to the declaration of the apostle, Gal. iv. 19. "My little children, of whom I travail in birth, until Christ be formed in you?" In order to understand how this new birth is effected, it is absolutely necessary to understand the *originality* of the soul of man; whether it is mortal, or immortal. If the soul is *originally mortal*, and continues so, it cannot exist *after the* dissolution of the animal functions; but must be *annihilated* by decomposition, so as to neither see heaven nor hell. If the souls of mankind are *originally immortal*, they will *undoubtedly be saved*. Without any *secondary* means, they would be their own saviours; for an immortal soul can never perish! Everlasting, eternal, unquenchable, consuming fire, can *never* make any impression on an immortal soul,—the gates of hell can never prevail against it; neither a *mortal*, nor an *immortal* soul, can *exist* in future misery.

Look at this, ye degraded ministers of Antichrist, while at the altar of your god Moloch, who was supposed to glory in the sufferings and torments of his victims. Was there ever spewed out of the dragon's mouth, any thing so nauseous and disgusting, as *your* degraded and inconsistent doctrine? Why do you tell people that their souls are *immortal*, and then tell them, that they will be *consumed* with unquenchable fire unto eternal destruction. It is an avowed sentiment of all denominations, that the souls of all mankind are *originally immortal*; the moment that any one can convince *me* of this, I will embrace the doctrine of *Universal salvation*; knowing, that no immortal soul can perish, or sin! If the soul is immortal, *whence came it?* Was it *extracted* from the immortal God, or generated by his Spirit? If it comes *from the Deity*, can it ever sin against him, or transgress against the foundation of its *origin?* Will the soul of man, God in man, fight against God in heaven? Would his kingdom stand, if thus divided against itself? Much less, could the soul of man, if it comes from God, go to hell in a future state. If it could sin against him, it is contrary to the Scriptures, and reason, to boast, that we came from God. I say *we*, for it is the soul of man that constitutes the man. Again, if the soul is generated in the image of immortality, when, and where is it done? for nothing short of God and his Spirit, the Holy Ghost, can beget an immortal soul. Now, if this is effected by the Holy Ghost at the first generation, no man under heaven can boast of being the father of his children; but like Mary, they would be conceived of the Holy Ghost, and be born sons and daughters of God; they would all be without father or mother, beginning of days, or end of life! Now, as Jesus Christ is the only person that was conceived of the Holy Ghost at the first birth, he is justly and fitly called by the apostle, 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. the blessed, and only Potentate, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords, who only hath immortality now, as Christ only hath immortality. He is the only person in heaven and in the earth, that is found worthy to open the book of immortal life, and give life eternal, immortal, unto all those that will receive him. Therefore, all mankind at their *first generation* and entrance into life, are *mortal*, corruptible beings, according to the Scriptures, and dying in that state, they cease to exist, and can only obtain immortality by regeneration. Unless we are regenerated and *born again*, we cannot *enter* into the kingdom of God.

DEAN.

(To be Concluded next week.)

ANSWER.

Friend Dean for once, appears to be in earnest. His communications heretofore, have been so obscure, that we were able only to understand a part; and the rest, we did not even presume to guess at. We have a good hope, now, of doing something. Friend Dean's *shots* fell half way,—ours were sometimes at a *venture*, but now, we have a distinct view of the object, the battle will be *short*, and, we trust, success certain.

Friend Dean commences with assuming a position, which in a qualified sense *only*, can by us be admitted. Namely,—"Now as all Christians are united in believing that they *obtain* their *salvation* by Jesus the Saviour, it becomes a grand question, what are they saved from?" Now we believe, that "a man is a Christian, *only* so far as he trusts *alone* to *Christ* for salvation," to the exclusion of every thing else which can be named, or imagined! Consequently, those who believe their *faith*, or *works*, or both united, are in the smallest possible degree *necessary* to the salvation of *their souls*, are *not* Christians! We, therefore, dissent from Friend Dean, and *deny* the truth of *his* position, on any other, than the above definition of the term. Friend Dean has said much about the sin of Adam being the sin of his posterity; and he now calls it the Editor's doctrine, and says it has been a stumbling-block in his way, &c., and speaks of *his* clearing away the rubbish. After reading this, we were surprised to find our correspondent at the close of his second paragraph, declaring, "here we are both on the same side of the question. Amen." Had Friend Dean consulted our answers to his communications, instead of his prejudices, we think he would have done much better. The success he has had "in overthrowing hereditary guilt," or *refuting* what we have *not contended* for, is a victory we shall not dispute his title to; nor envy him the *laurel* which he may receive in honour of the conquest. Friend Dean concludes his *first* paragraph, by saying, "The Editor, &c., could not devise means for a Saviour to be applied to mankind, in any other sense, than that of a *seed*, by which *generated* Adam is *regenerated*, or by which *mankind* are *regenerated* out of their *first animal* birth, nature, and image, into the *incorruptible* birth, nature, and *image* of God." Now, we have no hesitation in saying, that after qualifying this a little, we have no objection to it; neither have we objected to it. We have objected to the strange, and inconsistent phraseology, which Friend Dean has for so long a time been troubled with. We consider the "*first* animal birth (nature) of mankind," is, when they are *born* according to *natural generation* into *this mode* of existence. And we believe, and will *maintain* too, that Christ is the *seed* by which all mankind are UNCONDITIONALLY regenerated *out* of this *nature*, into what Friend Dean calls, "into the *incorruptible* birth, nature, and *image of god.*" Paul, in his 1st Epistle to Cor. xv. 49, 50, 51, &c. expresses *our* sentiments at full,—namely, "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth *corruption* inherit *incorruption.*" Is not this plain? It is *folly* for a man to give his assent to the *truth* of this, and then contend, that *in* this *corruptible* body he shall *experience* this *change*,—for Paul says, "Behold, I shew you a mystery, (all who *obey*, and are *good* men shall be raised incorruptible? no! Who then? Hear Paul.) We shall *not all* sleep, but we *shall all* be *changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the *dead shall be raised incorruptible*, and we shall be changed. For this *corruptible* [on condition, we are *good men* in this life, *may* put on *incorruption*,—Friend Dean, how do you like this? Now we do *not* like it. Hear Paul] For this *corruptible must put on incorruption*, and this *mortal* put on *immortality.*" And then, all who have not complied with the *conditions* of salvation, will *wail*, and *weep*, and *gnash* their *teeth*, and *blaspheme*.---Now, *one* of *two* things is inevitable. If salvation is *conditional*, *all* mankind will *then* have *complied* with the *conditions;* or salvation is *unconditional;* for Paul declares in the most unequivocal and unqualified manner imaginable, that "*then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up in victory,*" &c. Now, we ask, Is this conditional? If so, *name the condition!* Prove if you can, that *one* of the human race will be *raised* incorruptible *before* that time, or, that *one* of the human race will *not* be *raised* incorruptible *at* that time! Here is *our armour,---pierce it who can !!!* Friend Dean says, "It becomes a grand question, What are they [mankind] saved from? *their* sins, or the sins of their *primogeniture?*" We always have an answer at hand for this question.---"His name shall be called Jesus, *(Saviour)* for he shall *save* his people from *their sins.*" Now, we think, it must be evident, that mankind are to be "saved from their *sins.*" Who are *his* people? Ans. God says, "All *souls* are *mine*,"---Christ said, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given *all* things into his hands; thou hast given him power over *all flesh*, that he should give eternal *life* to as *many* as thou hast *given him.*"

(To be Concluded next week.)

To Correspondents.

All communications forwarded the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

Errata.

In Number 30, p. 121, 1 col. 23d line from the bottom, for *love to men*, read *love to me*. In 3d col. 20th line from the top, for *blessings arising from the obedience*, read *blessings arising from his obedience.*

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1820. NO. 32.

CONTROVERSIAL.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Gospel Herald.

(Concluded.)

Is it possible for any to be *regenerated*, before they are *generated*? No! It is impossible. Is not the *first* birth *conditional*, effected through the medium of *animal* agency? So also is the *second*, upon which all salvation is *dependent*. We are told, 2 Tim. i. 10. that "Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel;" and that it is obtained by none, but those, Rom. ii. 7. "who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life." It is impossible to be saved without eternal life; none have it, but those that seek for it, and continue patiently in well doing. Look at the conditions! Know ye not that the Scriptures are replete with conditions, from the advice of the Almighty to Cain, saying, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted, if not, sin lieth at the door," unto the last exhortation in the Revelations, "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city?" Pray, renounce the path that you have taken, and shut the licentious door that you have opened; and acknowledge, that the wicked perish, and are (2 Thes. i. 9.) "punished with everlasting destruction, Mal. iv. 1. burnt up, Isaiah x 19 both soul and body; also Mat. x. 28. Hosea ix. 6. gone because of destruction. Is not the doctrine of the Scriptures perfectly rational? They point out Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world; saving man from eternal death, if man will co-operate with his Spirit and receive through him immortal life.

There is no society in the world so pleasing to me, as that of the Friends; and since they have informed that Dean is *not* of their faith, he wishes *they* would *show wherein he is unsound!*

I have been requested to subscribe my whole and entire name,

WILLIAM DEAN,

Of Clinton, from Dutchess Co. State of New-York.

ANSWER.

(*Concluded*)

Friend Dean in his *second* paragraph, after exulting in obtaining a victory, when there had been no contest, says, "Reader, look at this! I expected that my antagonist would come out in his impenetrable armour, and testify, whether Christ's people's sins were Adam's sins, or not; seeing it is the ground work of his religion, that Christ saves all mankind from some sin or other," &c. We inform Friend Dean, that we do not buckle on *all* our armour for every foe,—and that we make a distinction between a real attack, and only a feigned one. We have considered Friend Dean in a state of *theological fermentation*, and have been patiently waiting until he became settled; and considering him to be in a comparative settled state, we shall examine him with greater attention,---and when necessary, he may depend on meeting us armed from head to foot! The subjects under discussion involve questions of great magnitude; and the only evidences which can be worthy of our acceptance, are the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, "which are profitable for doctrine, &c., and for instruction in righteousness."

Friend Dean commences his *third* paragraph, thus,---"Now seeing we are not contaminated with the guilt of Adam's transgression, how can you devise necessary means for a Saviour unto mankind in any other sense, than that of a *seed*, by which they are regenerated into the image of God, agreeably to the apostle, Gal. iv. 19. 'My little children, of whom I travail in birth until Christ be formed in you.' In order to understand how this new birth is effected, it is absolutely necessary to understand the *originality* of the soul of man; whether it is *mortal*, or *immortal*." Now it is our design to write plain, and not be misunderstood. We consider the declaration, 'visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation,' as having an exclusive and pointed reference to the Israelites; and the sins, or iniquities alluded to, were the idolatrous practices and worship of the Israelites, &c. See Exodus xx. 3, 4, 5. And this was not so much a denunciation, as a *warning* to the Jews, to abstain from idolatry, from the pernicious consequences which would result to their children. The *cause*, would be their corrupt *example*; the *consequence*, their children would copy after them, and forget their heavenly Father, from whom alone proceedeth every good and perfect gift. God told the Jews by his prophet, "It is *your sins* have separated between you and your God.' Or in other words,—I have not forsaken you,—you have forsaken me! This was the consequence of their idolatry; and was necessarily continued from father to son, by the corrupt tendency of bad examples. The commonly received opinion, that God visits *positively* the individual *sin* of Adam upon his posterity, not to the *third and fourth* generation, but to *three* or *four hundred* generations, is too absurd to merit a serious refutation. Mankind, each, in his own individual capacity, and person, are sufficiently guilty, without implicating them with the guilt of any other, or going back nearly 6000 years for evidence to convict a criminal in our day, of criminality, when the conscience of every man is sufficient and better testimony.

We consider Christ to be the *seed*, by which mankind are regenerated. And as *seed* is the *germ*, or first principle and *cause* of any thing, so we consider Christ, the anointed of God, the Saviour, Immanuel, God with us, or assuming our nature, and redeeming, sanctifying, and perfecting it, as the *Seed*, or *Cause*, by which the salvation of all men is effected, without condition, money, or price. The annunciation of this Seed (Christ) in Eden,—to Abraham, and the prophets, was unconditional, and universal. Consequently, if God made *no* conditions, why should we. The *law* was full of conditions; but the law could *not* give life—for, says the apostle, "If there had been a law which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." We believe all mankind *are* regenerated in Christ. What is *regeneration*? What is *generation*, or *to generate*? Ans. It is to *produce*. Consequently, *regeneration* is *reproduction*---and to regenerate, is to reproduce that which had *before* been *produced*, or *generated*, and was LOST! It would be an absurdity too great for comparison, to contend, that man in his present imperfect state is in the *image* of God. Was he ever in this *image*? Let God who made him, and who alone knows *how* he *made* him, decide. Gen i. 26 27. 'And God said, Let us make man *in our image*. So God created man *in his image*.' Is man, in his present *mode* of *existence*, and in his individual capacity, in *that image* NOW? No! He is not! Was he ever *in* the *image* of God? Yes! As certain as God is certain,---for he cannot *lie*, and he says, he made him "*in his image!*" How did he *lose* it? Ans. All we know, is, that he *lost* it by *transgression*. Consequently, no transgressor is *in* the *image* of God; for God is holy! All mankind are transgressors; consequently, not one of the race of Adam is in the image of God. Is there a man, who pretends he is *holy*, and *in* the *image* of God? If so, prove him,---Will he *die* for *his enemies*? Is he "*light*, and is there with him no darkness at all? Is he *love*? Does he never hate? Is he perfect? No man can stand this test! In the impressive language of Scripture, 'Ye are *dead!* and your *life* is hid with *Christ* in God.'

In answer to Friend Dean's declaration, "In order to understand how this new birth is effected, it is absolutely necessary to understand the *originality* of the soul of man; whether it is *mortal*, or *immortal*." We ask one simple question.—Will the soul of man ever be *immortal*? If the soul of man is *mortal*, and God has power to make it *immortal*, he has power to *unmake* it. What are we to understand by *immortality*? Is it the same as *eternal life*? We think not. For "to know God is life eternal." Consequently, *life*, and *light*, are convertible terms. The apostle says, of Christ, "hath brought *life* (eternal life) and *immortality* to light by the gospel." See 1 Tim. vi 14, 15, 16. "Until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; which in his times he shall show, the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who *only* hath *immortality*, dwelling in the *light* which no man can approach unto, which no man *hath seen*, or *can see*." Let no man, after reading this, pretend to perfection. For a kind of perfection that can be made *better*, or find a *superior*, is an absurdity! And let no man, after reading this, pretend that Christ is *in* him; for the time is coming when the *true* Christ, 'dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, or can see,' *will appear*, and eclipse the glory and perfection of these false Christs. Now, what shall we say of the *origin* of the soul of man, is it *mortal*, or *immortal*? What was the *origin* of the *soul*? Ans. God. "He *breathed* into man the breath of *life*, and man became a living soul." The word here translated *breath* (of life) is, in the original Hebrew, the same as the *Spirit* of God. "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou *shalt die*." Man *eat*, and *died!* He was *immortal*, for the *immortal* Spirit of the immortal God was in him, and *became* man's living *soul*. He *died!* He became *mortal*. The immortal God took *his* Spirit from him. In the day man transgressed he died a *spiritual* death, and became *mortal*. Before he transgressed, he was *immortal*, and spiritually *alive*. This was the *image* of God. When he died *spiritually*, he became of the *earth* alone, earthy. We think it is impossible for these Scripture *premises* to be admitted, without these *conclusions* inevitably following. Eternal life is found in the knowledge *of* God. To be *immortal*, is to be in the *image* of God; to be like God. "Ye are *dead*, and your life is *hid* with Christ in God." When did man *die*? Ans. When he by transgression *lost* the *Image*, or *Spirit*, or *Breath*, of his Maker! Where is this Image, or Spirit, or Breath? Ans. It is hid! It is where no man can find it! It is in God! No man can go to the Father but by Christ. It is *with* "Christ our Head, and when he shall appear, we shall see him as he is," and we shall then know what we shall be. Let those who pretend there is *no* change *after* death, ponder on these things. If there is no change after death, they will be *poor* creatures, destitute of immortality or the Spirit of God for ever without end! Now, What is it to be *born again*? What is it to be *born* at all? What is the meaning of the word *birth*? It is coming into life, or this mode of existence. The condition in which any man is born, Christ told Nicodemus, "Except a man is born again he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." What is the kingdom of God? Ans. "It is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." A natural figure is introduced to illustrate this birth. A man passes from darkness to light. From a sense of condemnation, to peace and joy. It is a change of circumstances in the mind,---darkness is error, light is truth. A man who is in this sense born again, enters into rest; he considers the work done by Christ, &c. It is *believing* the truth; the gospel of our salvation. But *that* which *produced* the salvation, is not the *new birth*. Mark the distinction. "We are dead,

and our life is hid with Christ in God." Our coming to the knowledge that we *are alive*, and have life *in* Christ, is being born again. But we were *regenerated*, when we were *made alive in Christ!* This was done without our knowledge. And the coming to the *knowledge* that we are alive *in* Christ, or regenerated, is being *born again*, or having *new* life, which we were ignorant of before, and this cannot take place without our knowing it; for *coming to* this knowledge is the *being born*. This can be illustrated, as follows,---an infant child in a state of unconsciousness relative to the affairs of this life, has bequeathed him an inheritance by will; this makes him *rich*, but he knows nothing about it. He is therefore as *poor*, as respects any conscious enjoyment of his fortune, as though none were bequeathed him. Let this be *regeneration*. "Except he is *born*," or comes to the knowledge of this *fact*, "he cannot enter into" the enjoyment of it. Let this be the new birth, or, being *born again*. Now this infant in his nonage may enjoy by anticipation the fortune bequeathed him, and which he will receive at the age of 21; and believers enjoy by anticipation their heavenly inheritance, which is hid, or treasured up in Christ for them!

Friend Dean adds, "If the soul is originally *mortal*, and continues so, it cannot exist after the dissolution of the animal functions; but must be annihilated by decomposition, so as to neither see heaven, nor hell. If the souls of mankind are originally *immortal*, they will *undoubtedly* be saved. Without secondary means, they would be their own saviours; &c. neither a *mortal*, nor an *immortal* soul, can exist in *future* misery!" And this, Reader, from one who denies, and has undertaken to confute the doctrine of the unconditional and universal salvation of men! How Friend Dean, after making the above declarations, can object to *unconditional* salvation, is more than we can conceive. He says, "Without secondary means they would be their own saviours,"—we presume, by *secondary means*, he intends Christ, the seed, &c. He denies *future* misery in the great, positively. And without the seed, or Christ, saves them, they must save themselves,---or, what? What alternative has he left? Annihilation, and no other! Now, Christ says, "Because I live, ye shall live also,"—not, if you will save yourselves, or comply with conditions, you shall live! The life of men depends, and is predicated upon the life of Christ; and when Friend Dean can prove that Christ shall cease to exist, he can substantiate the doctrine of the annihilation of the human race, or a part of them, and not before! Reader, can it be possible that we have mistaken our correspondent? We think the following, from his *fourth* paragraph, is proof positive, that we have not mistaken him. Namely,—"It is an avowed sentiment of all denominations, that the souls of all mankind are *originally immortal*; the moment that any one can convince *me* of *this*, I will *embrace* the doctrine of *Universal salvation*; knowing, that no *immortal* soul can perish, or sin!" Again, look at his *third* paragraph, "If the soul of man is originally mortal, and continues so,' &c.; he believes the soul, originally is *mortal*,---he does not believe in Universal salvation. Why? Of this he can give no sufficient reason. What does he believe? Ans. In a partial, or limited salvation! What is to become of those, who, according to his view, are *not* saved? He says the soul must be "annihilated by decomposition, so as to neither see heaven, nor hell!"

Friend Dean, in his *fourth* paragraph, interrogates, &c. "If the soul is immortal, whence came it?" We have proved, that the soul came immortal from God! Again, he asks, 'Was it extracted,' &c. This phraseology is inadmissible. We think Friend Dean was not aware of the meaning of the words he used. Again, he interrogates, "If it comes from the Deity, can it ever *sin* against him, &c., will the soul of man, God in man, fight against God in heaven?" To this we say, no! For the soul of man "is dead, and hid with Christ in God." Man has a '*law* in his *members*, warring against the law in his mind,' &c. He adds,—"Much less, could the soul of man, &c., for nothing short of God and his Spirit, the Holy Ghost, can beget an immortal soul." We have proved positively from the Scriptures, that the *soul* of man came from God, and was his, God's Spirit. Friend Dean declares, roundly,—"Now, if this is effected by the Holy Ghost, at the *first generation*, no man under heaven can boast of being the father of his children," &c. And, we say, No man under heaven can *boast* that he is the father of his children, only in a *qualified* sense! The Scriptures declare positively, that "God is the Father of the spirits of all flesh!" Consequently, no man is the father, or producing instrument, (not cause) of the *Spirit*, of the fruit of his *body*; but only, of the body, which is *dust*, and unto dust must return, but the 'Spirit returns to God who gave it.' We request Friend Dean to pardon our plainness; for we, in honest sincerity, say, we think him to be *Theologically insane!*

We now proceed to examine the reasoning of Friend Dean. We shall insist upon his having premises for his conclusions; and conclusions for his premises. We cannot consistently accreditsuch illegitimate productions. The concluding remarks and positions contained in his *fourth* paragraph, are an heterogeneous mixture of extravagant opinions, and strange ideas, which, in a confused jumble, are ushered before the public 'with all their imperfections on their heads.' He says, Christ was the only person that was conceived of the Holy Ghost, at the *first* birth. Therefore, he concludes, that all mankind at their *first generation* and entrance into life, are *mortal*, &c.; and dying, in that state, they *cease* to *exist*, and can only obtain immortality by regeneration; and as proof of this, he quotes the declaration of Christ, with an addition, "Except we are regenerated, and born again, we cannot enter into the kingdom of God." He then interrogates; "Is it possible for any to be *regenerated* before they are generated? And answers,—No! It is impossible. Is not the *first* birth conditional, effected through the medium of animal agency?" And answers,—"So also is the second, upon which all salvation is dependent." Now, we venture to assert, that, ransack all creation through, a more curious position cannot be produced, or one, from which such strange conclusions are deduced! Are these premises true? If so, Adam, the progenitor of our race is damned with annihilation, as certain as he had an existence. For according to Friend Dean's arrangement, and definitions, Adam was never generated; and he contends, that it is impossible for a man to be *regenerated*, except he is *first, generated* by conditional generation, effected through the medium of animal agency! Friend Dean is very obscure in his expressions. Are we to consider the *condition* to be on the part of the *begetters*, or *begotten*? We really think Friend Dean can lay claim to a new invention in theology, and that he has generated a new sect. *Socinus*, the father of our modern Unitarians, *alias*, Socinians, taught, that salvation was conditional; and the condition, good works; and those wicked folks, who could not produce these goods, and consequently, did not comply with the condition, were tormented in a future state for a certain time, and then annihilated. But Friend Dean has improved upon this. He will have it, that wicked people who are found wanting, will not exist in a future state. Consequently, he is a little tinctured with Deism. We hope Friend Dean will impute our plainness to the right cause, namely, a wish to call things by their right names. Although we should be sorry to give *just* cause of offence to any one, still, we had much rather, if there is no other alternative, offend all men, than offend against the truth. And that truth is, that "*God is the Saviour of all men!!!* 1 Tim. iv. 10.

We request Friend Dean to reconsider his opinions; in the words of the apostle, "to examine, whether he is in the faith." We think, if he were to make a proper and necessary distinction between *regeneration*, and the new birth, or being *born again*, he would be more consistent. His quotation from the words of Christ, was altogether gratuitous in the addition of the word regeneration. Luke calls Adam the Son of God. And Christ said, When thou prayest, say, 'Our Father.' The Scriptures declare, that "God is the Father of the Spirits of all flesh." Paul declares, our corruptible bodies shall be raised incorruptible. And the prophet said, "Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham was ignorant of us." And Paul told the Galatians, "For ye are all the children of God, by faith in Christ." Now, it is evident, that the Galatians believing that they were the children of God, could not make God their Father. He was their Father before they knew it, or believed it; and as a necessary consequence, they who were fatherless in *form*, (not knowing they had a heavenly Father) were not so in *fact*, before they came to that knowledge. God, therefore, is the Father of all men. "For all were made by him, and for him." But all lost the knowledge of their heavenly Father; they were in one sense fatherless, at least so far as respected their knowledge of him; as much so, as they would have been, had God not been their Father; although he never forgot them, nor forsook them. In contradistinction to this, being, derived from God, is Christ, the head of every man. "The word was made flesh. Being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal to, (or as) God, and took upon himself the form of a servant." This form was human nature, the servant of sin. The child Jesus, therefore, was begotten in a sense different from any of the human race. They were *made* or *formed* of the *earth*. But the *soul*, which came from God, and was an *emanation* from him, was not of the *earth*; and may be considered as *generated* by God himself, when he *breathed* into man, and man received the *immortal* Spirit which constituted him by its *union* with him (the *man*, or earth,) a *living soul*. Man by transgression, *died*, and lost the knowledge of his *origin*. He was no longer *immortal* by his intimate union with the *Spirit* of God, which was the *breath*, breathed into his nostrils. The *Spirit* was poured upon, or into Adam *in* measure. But in Christ, our Head from heaven, "dwelt the *fulness* of the Godhead bodily." He, for all men, the members of his body, rendered perfect obedience to his law.—He regenerated the whole race; and that race on coming to the knowledge of this truth, are *born again*; for they pass from a state of darkness and *death*, to light and *life!*

We think Friend Dean must be sensible of the indefensibility of the ground he has taken; for to predicate his doctrine of *conditional* salvation on an *assumed* position, without any proof except his own declaration, and that, disproved by the conclusions which inevitably flow from it, is inconsistent to the last degree. Is salvation *conditional*, and that condition containing *prerequisites*, which exceed the powers of the subject to procure, is this just, or reasonable? No! Has not our correspondent required, first, generation by *animal* agency, as indispensable to regeneration? He has. How then, can Adam, or Eve, ever be saved? Were they generated by *animal* agency? No! His premises, therefore, fall to the ground.

Friend Dean introduces a quotation, 2 Tim. i. 10. by saying, "We are told, that 'Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel;' and that it is obtained by none, but those, Rom. ii. 7. 'Who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life." What is the meaning of bringing any thing to *light*? Ans. It is making *known* a *fact*, of which, they, to whom it is made known, were *ignorant* of *before*. Supposing a messenger was to tell Friend Dean, that his father, or a relative, had by an unalterable will bequeathed to him a fortune; this would be bringing it to *light*. If the message making this known, was called *gospel*, or good news, it would be brought to light *through* the gospel. Pray what would Friend Dean think, were he afterwards told, that this fortune was to be possessed by him on certain *conditions*? And this, *after* telling him, that the *fortune* was *given* to him by will, an unalterable will, without regard to *his* merit, or deserts, that he should not boast himself? Ans. We think he would tell the person who talked of conditions, that *he was a fool!* Now, look at the text quoted; see the preceding, the 9th verse. "Who *hath* saved us, (it is done!) and called *us* with an holy calling, *not* according to *our* works, (if it was conditional, and according to *our works*, it would not be a very *holy* calling, for our works are *not* holy;) but according to his *own purpose* and grace, which was given us (is this conditional? To give a thing, and then say, you shall not have it, unless you comply with certain condi-

tions, this *is selling*,) in Christ Jesus *before* the world began." Now, in the name of common sense, how is it possible for that which was *done* before the world *began*, to have the *doing* of *it* a contingent, and depend upon *conditions*, which *might*, or might *not* take place, thousands of years *posterior* to the *time*? We challenge all creation to produce any thing, or to put words together which shall have *less* of condition, bargain, and sale, than the text quoted by Friend Dean to prove conditions! Why, Friend Dean, thou art verily blind. There is, however, *one* objection, and only *one*, which can be brought against us; and that is, not to prove conditions, but to *limit* the life and immortality to a *few*. Namely,—it is only the *elect*, who are here spoken of. Granted,—so much the better! For the *salvation* of the *elect*, themselves, *depends* altogether upon the salvation of the *non-elect!* Proof. Paul says, see 9th verse, "Who hath saved us, (the elect,) and called us with an holy calling, *not according to our works*, (according to what, then? Ans.) but according to *his* own *purpose* and *grace*," &c. Now what is *his own purpose*? You, who have admitted Paul as good evidence in this, his testimony contained in his Epistle to Timothy, are, we think, under an imperious obligation to attach the same credit to his testimony in his Epistle to the Ephesians, in which, see chap. i. 9, 10. he declares, that God, "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, (which before it was made known, was a secret,) according to his *good pleasure* (will not God do his good pleasure?) which *he* hath *purposed* in himself, (is not this the *purpose* Paul spoke of to Timothy?) That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, *all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, in him." T is is the *purpose* of God, the *salvation of all men;* and the *elect* are called to the *knowledge* of this purpose, which is to them an earnest of *their* inheritance, being the certainty of their own salvation! Now, Friend Dean, take another look at your quotation, and the addition you were pleased to make to it. "We are told 2 Tim. i. 10. that Christ hath brought life and immortality to light *through* the gospel; and that it is obtained by none, but those, Rom. ii. 7. 'Who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life.' We ask you, is this true? Did this very Paul, whom you have quoted, and *misquoted*, too, did he obtain eternal life, and was it given to him as a reward for *his* patient continuance, &c? Let us ask Paul, he can tell all about it!

How was it, Paul? Ans. "God who is rich in mercy, *for his great love* wherewith he loved *us*," stop a moment, Paul,—you mean God loved *you* with great love, *when* you by "patient continuance in well doing" *deserved* his love? Answer, Paul.—"Even when we *were dead in sins* hath quickened us together with Christ." Ephes. ii. 4, 5.

Brother Paul, this being a matter of great consequence, and much disputed in our day, we want you to be *very particular*. Now do you mean to say, that God loved sinners, *ungodly* sinners, or that Christ died to save *good men*? Answer Paul,—"For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the *ungodly*. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a *good man* some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we *were* yet *sinners*, Christ died for *us*."

Well, Brother Paul, it is not disputed but what Christ *died;* but what did he accomplish by his death? There are certain persons, who say, that Christ *only* made it *possible* to be saved? Ans. Paul,—"Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him."

Do you mean, brother Paul, that we are really *saved*? Now, we are told that God loves *only* those who love *him*, and that he will *never* save his *enemies*, and that *they* will be miserable for ever! Ans Paul,—"If *when* we were *enemies* we *were* reconciled to God by the death of his *Son; much more, being* reconciled, we shall be saved by his *life*." Rom. v. 6 to 10.

But we are told, brother Paul, that all this is *conditional;* and if *we* do *not* perform certain *good* works, &c., there is *no* salvation for us. Ans. Paul; "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto *another* gospel; which is *not* another; but there be some that would trouble you, and would *pervert* the *gospel of Christ*. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach *any other* gospel unto you, than that which *we* have preached unto you, *let him be accursed*. Gal. i. 6, 7, 8. According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed *how he buildeth* thereupon. For other foundation can *no* man *lay*, than that is laid, *which is Jesus Christ*. Now, if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; *every* man's work shall be manifest. For the *day* shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by *fire;* and the *fire* shall *try every man's work*, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be *burned*, he shall *suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved;* yet so as *by fire*." 1 Cor. iii. 10 to 15.

Are *all men*, then, to be *saved*? Ans. Paul,—'We both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the *Saviour of all men*, specially of those that believe.'

But we are told, brother Paul, that when you say, '*specially* of those that *believe*,' you mean that *none* but *believers* are saved by Christ, and that *unbelievers* are *not* justified, nor benefited by Christ's righteousness. Ans. Paul,—"Now we know that what things soever the *law saith*, it saith to them who are under the law; that *every mouth* may be *stopped*, and all the world may become guilty (unjust) before God. *Therefore*, by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be *justified* in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.—But *now* the righteousness of God *without the law* is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the *prophets;* (see Isaiah xlv. 23, 24.) even the *righteousness of God* by faith of (not in) Jesus Christ *unto all* (unbelievers and believers) and upon all them that *believe;* for there is *no difference*—For *all have sinned* and come short of the glory of God; *being justified freely* by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Romans, iii. 19. to 24 verses.

What then do you mean, brother Paul, when you say, "To them, who by patient continuance in well doing, *seek* for *glory*, and *honour*, and *immortality*, ETERNAL LIFE," ii. 7. Ans. Paul,—"Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto *death*, or of obedience unto *righteousness*? For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." vi. 16. 23.

How is this, brother Paul? you say, 'the wages of *sin* is *death;* How then, can they who die in sin be *saved*? Ans. Paul.—"The *law* entered that the *offence* might *abound;* but *where* sin abounded, *grace* did much *more* abound; that as sin hath reigned unto *death*, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto *eternal life*, by Jesus Christ our Lord." v. 20. 21.

Now, Friend Dean, upon reflection, do you not think your statement is incorrect? Namely,—"We are told 2. Tim. i. 10. that Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel: and that it is *obtained by none*, but *those*, Romans ii. 7. 'Who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory,' &c. How long did the *thief* on the *cross*, (to whom Christ said, 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise,') *seek*? Tell, if you can, of HIS *patient continuance in well-doing!!!* Because Paul encourages to perseverance, those, who 'seek for glory and immortality,' by telling them they shall have '*eternal life*,' shall we presume to say, that it will be obtained by *none else*? If so, we may add—Paul says, "Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil;" and none that do *evil*, will have eternal life! Friend Dean, this will not do. You added,—"It is impossible to be saved without eternal life; (granted,) *none* have it, but those who seek for it, and continue patiently in well doing." Now, Friend Dean, will *you* believe the record which God hath given of his Son? If so, "This is the record, that we have eternal life, and this life is in his Son." You say, '*none have it*, but those that seek for it,' &c.—Will you believe JEHOVAH? If so, Hear,—"I am found of *them that* sought me not," Isaiah lxv. 1. Again—Have not those eternal life who are redeemed? 'Return unto me, for I have (not *will*, if *you will*) redeemed thee.' Verily, thou art wrong, Friend Dean. You immediately added,—"Look at the conditions!" We have looked—and found NONE! You continue—"know ye not (in truth, we know *not*,) that the Scriptures are replete with conditions, from the advice of the Almighty to Cain, saying, 'If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? (Quere. If none were accepted but those who do well, very few, if any, would be accepted; for "he that offendeth in *one* point, is guilty of *all;* and in many things we offend all." James, ii. 10. iii. 2.) If not, sin lieth at the door,' unto the last exhortation in the Revelations,—'If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city." Did God tell Cain, that he should have eternal life and immortality, if he *done well*, and if he did not do well, he should be *annihilated*, or *miserable without end*? No such thing! The salvation of the *soul* of Cain was not even hinted at—it was the acceptance, or non-acceptance of his *offering*, which was spoken of. The passage quoted from Rev. xxii. does not even allude to the immortality of the soul, or promise any thing on the performance of any condition. It simply declares the *consequence* to unbelievers, who *pervert* the Scriptures, by *adding to*, or *taking from* them—it promises *no* immortality, on condition these things are *not* done. We, however, consider these things as *cause* and *consequence*. The man who twists the Scriptures, and adds to, or takes from them, that he may save himself, and *damn* his neighbour, as a consequence, has *no* foundation for his *own* hopes of salvation;—for the promises include *all* men, and he *blots out his own name*, when he blots out his neighbour's.

Friend Dean continues,—"Pray renounce the path that you have taken, and *shut the licentious door* that *you* have opened, and acknowledge, that the wicked perish; and are, Thes. i. 9. punished with everlasting destruction, Mal. iv. 1. Burnt up. Isaiah, x. 19. Both soul and body. Also, Matt. x. 28.—Hosea, ix. 6. Gone because of destruction." Now, we inform Friend Dean, that the 'path we have taken,' is 'the good old way,' spoken of in the Scriptures; and *our* faith, the faith of all the prophets, by whom God testified of the RESTITUTION of *all things*, &c. See Acts, iii. 21. We likewise inform him, that the 'licentious door' was opened by *Paul*, not by *us;* and teaches a very different doctrine from *licentiousness*, if Paul may be believed; who declared, in his Epistle to Titus, ii. 11 to 15 verses. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared; teaching us, [licentiousness?—No!] that denying all ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, *looking for* (what? Damnation—fire and brimstone—endless misery—annihilation, no! for) that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us (not we do the work) from *all iniquity*, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works. These things (says Paul) speak with *all authority*. Let no man despise thee." We follow Paul, as Paul followed Christ If *we* are wrong—*Paul* was wrong. If *Paul* was right, *we* are *right!* We, however, have *no* fears of being *wrong*. And in conformity with Paul's injunction, 'These things will *we* speak with *all authority*,'—and we *command* thee, *Friend Dean, to believe them!*

Friend Dean says, 'acknowledge that the wicked perish,'—This *we* always *have* acknowledged; and do still. 'And are, 2 Thes. i. 9 punished with everlasting destruction,'—This we likewise acknowledge fully, according to the *original;* that they shall *be punished* with destruction, αἰώνιον, *for ages* from the *presence* of the Lord, and from the *glory* of his *power*.' We now, ask,—who did Paul mean,

by those that *know not God*, &c? Ans. The Jews. Proof. The Jews are called the peculiar people of God. God said, 'My people *perish*.' How? Ans. For lack of knowledge.' Knowledge of what? Ans. Of God. For 'it is life eternal to know God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.' Again. God says, 'My people do not know!' Christ came at the destruction of Jerusalem in flaming fire, and took vengeance on the Jews, who knew him not. They perished. They were banished, and reserved in judicial blindness in that *state*, prepared for the devil and his angels, and *departed* into it, for *ages*. This was consonant with Christ's declaration to them,---'Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me,' &c. You will please to notice in particular, that they are not only punished with destruction from his presence, but from the '*glory of his power*.' Now, in what does the *glory of Christ's power consist*? Ans. *Salvation!* He is 'Mighty to *save*.' This is the *glory* of Christ,---*Salvation*. Of his power to save, the Jews were, and are ignorant. But shall these Jews thus destroyed *never* return? Hear the prophet,---'Thou *turnest* man to *destruction*, and sayest, *return* ye children of men. O thou enemy, destructions have come to a *perpetual end*.' See Ezek. xxxvii. We likewise believe, Malachi iv. 1. that the wicked are burnt up. And with David, 'Thou wilt destroy the wickedness *of* the *wicked*.' Friend Dean went on with the work of destruction at a great rate, after referring to Isaiah x.19. without quoting, or examining the connexion, he added,---'*both soul and body*.' Stop a moment,---not too fast. Let Isaiah speak for himself. Please to commence at the 5th verse. The king of Assyria is sent against Jerusalem.' The 12th verse says, 'Wherefore, &c. I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks.' See ver. 17, 18. 'And the light of Israel shall be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame; and it shall burn and devour his *thorns* and his *briers* in one day. And shall consume *the glory* of his *forest* and of his fruitful *field*, *both soul and body*; and they shall be as when a standard-bearer *fainteth*." Examine this *figure*,---The *stout heart* and the *glory* of the *high looks* of the *king* of Assyria, were upheld, and consisted in his *army*, who in the 17th verse, are compared to *briers* and *thorns*,---and the *forest* and *field* which produces *briers* and *thorns*, when *destroyed*, can produce *no* more,---and their glory *consists*, in their *reproductive* powers,---this *glory* is to be *consumed*,—'*soul and body*,'—cause and effect. 'As when a standard-bearer *fainteth*.' If a standard-bearer *fainteth*, he *falls*,—his standard (colours) fall with him and *disappear*. If Friend Dean is dissatisfied with this exposition, and will have it that the Assyrians *were* destroyed *soul* and *body*, we reply, *be it so*; we can find a *remedy*, even for *these!* See Isaiah xix. 24, 25. 'In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the land; whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, *Blessed be* Egypt my people, and *Assyria the work of my hands*, and Israel mine inheritance.' Now, Friend Dean, Can *you* 'devise a way, or means,' to *bless* the *Assyrians* after they are destroyed *soul* and *body*, 'in any other way,' than to admit, that they 'returned from destruction?' And as you hold, that all *souls* are generated by animal agency, we think you *must* acknowledge, that these Assyrians, after having their *mortal souls* and bodies destroyed (according to you, annihilated) are made *immortal*, and saved, by the regeneration of *God!* You refer to Matt. x. 28. We inform you, that text will never be made to prove, that God ever *did*, or ever *will* destroy one soul! You next refer to Hosea ix. 6. and say, 'Gone, because *of* destruction.' True, Friend Dean, but heaven be praised, they are *coming again!* Read on! Chap. xi. 8. "How shall I give thee up, &c. My heart is turned within me, &c. Chap. xiii. 14. "I *will ransom* them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. (Now let destruction revel in destruction, and death and hell, or the grave, rot together.) O Death, I will be *thy* plague; (not man's) O grave, I will be *thy* destruction!" (not the souls of men)

Friend Dean continues,---"Is not the doctrine of the Scriptures perfectly *rational*?" O, Yes,---Beautiful beyond description; for *salvation*, not *damnation* is their theme!!! "O Israel, *thou* hast destroyed *thyself*, but in *me* is thy *help*." Friend Dean adds, "They point out Jesus Christ as the Saviour *of the world*" True, and he *has* saved the world. *it is done!* Friend Dean continues,—'Saving man *from eternal death*,---if man will *co-operate* with his Spirit and receive through him immortal life." Now all we ask of Friend Dean, is, to inform us, *where* the 'Scriptures point out Jesus Christ as saving man *from* eternal death, *if* man will *co-operate* with his Spirit and receive through him immortal life?' We assert in the most unqualified manner imaginable, that the *Scriptures point out no such thing!*

Infidelity Considered.

(*Continued from page* 115.)

The Spirit of the world which we have considered to be the essence of Infidelity, whether it is employed in church or state, the nature of its operations are the same, though professedly in pursuit of opposite objects; and thus it is, that where church and state are united, it always produces a *monster*, with *two* bodies to *one* head,—a body *politic*, and a body *religious*, having for their head the wisdom of the world. How preposterous and abominably wicked is it for the man of sin, the son of perdition, the wisdom of the world, which is enmity with God, that it should assume the control and authority of the church, for no other reason, than because it has the secular power, which is the peculiar prerogative of the spirit of the world. But what have Christians to do with this, who, to enlist under the banner of Christ, and affirm allegiance to the reign of his Spirit in them, *must deny* the spirit of the world? Certainly they have not any thing more than Christ himself had, who *renounced it* by word and conduct, saying, My kingdom is not of this world; and by acting up to this, by laying down his natural life in favour of this testimony. And told his disciples, *not to be* of the world, even as he *was not* of the world.

But the Spirit of infidelity, what has it not done in opposing the work of God, and his Divine operations upon the soul? The serpent is here, professedly, in the Spirit of light and wisdom, by which it seduced the first *pair* in Paradise, who by their adherence to this deception, were excluded from their union and communion with their Creator, and expelled his presence. This is the effect it has had from that time to this, upon all who have rejected the Lord and chosen lying vanities. Witness the effect it had upon Cain,—those antediluvians, of whom the Lord declared, that all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth; and that peculiar people, the Israelites, for disobeying the command, which saith Moses, "I command thee this day. It is not hidden from thee; neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go for us to heaven and bring it unto us, that we may know it, and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us to bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it. But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it." Mark the fate of this people in consequence of rejecting this law! Is it not as Moses foretold? "Even all nations shall say,—Wherefore hath the Lord done thus unto this land? What meaneth the *heat* of this great anger? Then men shall say, Because they have forsaken the covenant of the Lord God of their fathers, which he made with them when he brought them forth out of the land of Egypt; for they went and served other gods whom they know not, and whom he had not given unto them; and the anger of the Lord was kindled against this land to bring upon it all the curses that are written in this book, and the Lord rooted them out of their land in anger and in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into another land as it is this day." To the same purport, though in other words, is the charge given by King David to his son. "And thou Solomon, my son, know thou the God of thy fathers, and serve him with a perfect heart, and a willing mind; for the Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts. If thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou reject him, he will cast thee off for ever."

These things, therefore, are mentioned, to show, that it is the spirit of infidelity, although professedly wise, yea, a teacher of the thoughts of God,---for, saith the serpent, "God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then shall your eyes be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil;" that seduced and led man from the Spirit of God in the first instance, and it is this, and this alone, that ever has, and still does lead from the manifestation of the Spirit, and *from* that *grace of God which bringeth salvation, which hath appeared* (not to an elect few, but) to all men; teaching, that denying ungodliness and worldly lust, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." And as it leads from the Spirit of truth, and its manifestations, so it teaches an opposite doctrine according to its *carnal* conceptions of God and the Scriptures. Whereas the spiritual doctrine is, "No man knoweth the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealeth him; and that *no man can* call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." Here is the "strait gate and narrow way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. But the infidel Antichristian doctrine is very different,—it teacheth, that God is to be known through some other medium than Jesus Christ; namely, from nature, and *from Scripture*; and hence it is, that infidelity reigns, and *Antichrist's* ministers are more numerous in Christendom than the ministers of the true tabernacle which God hath pitched and not man. Because, according to their doctrine, a man can be not only a Christian, but a minister of Christ in the *midst of his sins*; and hence, the necessary qualification is not that which cleanseth from all sin, to wit, a confession of a gospel power in their souls which is effectual to cleanse, but a confession or gospel book, and a knowledge of the language in which this was originally written. Then any *upstart*, who is so far within the bounds of decency as to be of good moral character, can *set up* and be ordained a minister of that gospel which is derived from nature, and a book, which to know, is not life eternal. And hence it is, that we see ungodly men officiating in the priest's office, not only that they may get a morsel of bread, but that they may have fat stipends, be called *rabbi*, *rabbi*, clothed in soft raiment, and fare sumptuously every day; *not* out of the fruits of their own labour, but out of the labour of the rich or poor dupes, who believe in, and follow them. And these, too, are not content to act upon a small scale of deception, but have hit upon a plan to Christianize from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth, in their way, and through the medium which they have adopted, saying, peace—but what peace so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?

AN IMPARTIALIST.

(The remainder with remarks, next week.)

To Subscribers.

Subscribers who have not complied with the conditions of the G. Herald, by paying their subscriptions, &c., would confer a great favour on the Editor, by advancing the same, as soon as may be compatible with their convenience. To our city subscribers, in particular, our best acknowledgments are due, for their hitherto prompt and cheerful payment, &c.; and when it is considered, that the expenses incurred in publishing the G. Herald exceed the sum received, &c., it is presumed, no other argument will be necessary.

To Correspondents.

Vine-dresser is informed, that he is, agreeable to his request, "admitted as one of our correspondents;" and that his communication shall be published in its turn.

All communications forwarded the Editor per mail, to be published in this paper, must be "post paid." City correspondents are informed, that a letter box is placed at the entrance of the office of the Gospel Herald, 93 Gold Street, for the reception of their communications.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1820. NO. 33.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Infidelity Considered.

(*Continued from page* 132.)

Thus infidelity reigns, not only in its true and naked form, with those who make no pretensions to know God, which is more tolerable and less injurious to mankind in general, and to the good of souls in particular, but lamentable indeed, it has assumed *Christ's righteousness*, and espoused the Christian cause, and not upon the plains of Dura alone has it set up an image, nor in all kingdoms and countries, but more thorough is the deep laid plan, and better calculated to deceive is the deception. The idol, instead of the real, is a speculative image of God, is set up by an impression upon the soul; all nations, kindreds, tongues and people, are called upon, both small and great; and the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, instead of hiding themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, which would be giving way to the Majesty of heaven in order that he might rule and reign in them, whose right it is, and that the ascending angel from the east, very figurative of Christ rising into dominion in the soul, having the seal of the living God, might seal the servants of the Most High in their foreheads. But how stout do they stand in their own unsanctified natures, not only opposing the simplicity and efficacy of the gospel power in themselves, which if they would give way to, it would instruct them better than to exalt the written testimonials thereof, to the exclusion and to the preference of the gospel spirit of which they treat, styling of them as his revealed will to man, and at the same time, gainsaying and revolting from the teaching of the Holy Spirit of which they treat. Is not this the worst of idolatry, not erecting, as above expressed, on the plains of Dura, Nebuchadnezzar-like, an image, nor yet locating on any outward spot for its establishment, but in the mind. The Spirit of infidelity assuming Christ's righteousness, is there setting up an image, or ideal God, and not in reality from his own Divine image, impressed upon the soul by and through the immediate revelation of his Holy Spirit, but by, and through an *outward* revelation from *nature*, and from *Scripture*. How inconsistent are such proceedings with the true benign Spirit of the Gospel, to which the Holy Scriptures point, and on these Scriptures, the very spirit of Antichrist is laying hands, and extending from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth, for what? Why under pretence, to be sure, that the knowledge of God may cover the globe, as the sea covers the channels of the mighty deep; an exalted, and specious pretence, indeed, equal to that of Capernaum, even to heaven, and like her, must in God's own will and time, be thrust down to hell, or a state of distress due to such rebellion. Now make the best, and all that can be made, either by men or devils of such an extension of Scripture, under pretence of its being the Lord's work, and it will be the work of infidelity and of Antichrist still, and nothing better in the result can come of it, than the fruits which are produced by such spirits. "For by their fruits shall ye know them." This is a lamentable evil in our highly professing Christian land, where the door of freedom is widely extended, and which will only be kept open by a right use of this freedom; for "all evil has its origin in the abuse of good." Some will be ready to query, is it an *evil* to give the most extensive *circulation* to the *Scriptures*? Most certainly it is, in the same proportion as the spirit and intention of this circulation is from an Antichristian source! Who is so blind, and hood-winked *by the priest*, as not to see, that it is to open a wide field of labour for missionaries and ministers of the gospel, as they are *called*. They would feign make the people believe, that salvation is through them, and the word of God; (the Scriptures,) or why do they hold up an idea, that souls will be lost for the want of such assistance? Strip them of their *pay*, see then, what will become of their *activity* and their *zeal* in religion for the good of souls! It is presumable at least, that such pastors would decline caring for the flock, and leave them exposed to every invader. It may be objected, that they which *preach* the gospel, should live of the gospel. Very true,—but fulfil the former, then be partakers of the latter! This would be according to righteousness. But nominally, and not really to preach the gospel, entitles no man to a life in the gospel. "The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it? By their fruits shall ye know them. Men do not gather grapes of thorns;" neither can the people be benefited by a mere nominal preacher, nor ought they to be deceived, much less, *to pay for the deception:* for this would be to encourage infidelity in the building up of Antichrist's kingdom, and bind upon themselves, for the deception of their souls, grievous, nay the worst of burdens and grievous to be borne.

It is to be hoped, that every good work will prosper; nor will it fail of prosperity, only as its dependance is withdrawn from all good; for it is from hence all good proceeds, and is dependant, both for its origin and prosperity. But how just is it, if the greatest good should fall into evil hands, that it should fail of success? Nay, how impossible is it, that it should be otherwise? The Scriptures, the very best of books, unless they are preached up and extended in the very same good Spirit in which they were written, are as parables in the mouth of fools. And infidel hands will succeed no better in spreading of them, than those *vagabond Jews did*, who undertook to cast out an evil spirit, by that good Spirit that Paul preached. The man in whom the evil spirit was, exclaimed, Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye? and leaped upon them and overcame them! Just so preposterous and absurd it must appear to the rational heathen, as they are called, to have men of unhallowed dispositions, and unsanctified tempers, present themselves as ministers of the sanctuary, and distributors of the blessed testimonials of the scriptures; for these, however without God, and the writings of sacred things, they may seem to be, they are not entirely destitute of the knowledge of that good Spirit by which Paul preached, which, though they may not abide its dictates, so as to be one with it in all their movements, yet they will spurn the imposing hand which in pretence is extended for their benefit, but in reality, merely to *dupe* them. Were the missionaries themselves one with this Spirit in all their religious movements, they would no sooner attempt to Christianize from no other knowledge of God, than from nature, and a book, than they would be hired to carry a dark lantern in the night to a powder plot. This would be a heinous crime, which if detected, would be severely punished. But the deception, and (if it is warrantable to say) the destruction of souls, has become a very popular and praiseworthy employment, in which all denominations seem to have a hand. A great cry about religion, and much is doing to put the *mote* out of our *brother's eye*, while our every day conduct, both in private, and in public, at home, and abroad, in a religious and political capacity, proves undeniably, that the *beam is still in our own*. That this is not a mere assertion, contrast the fruits of professors with the Spirit of Christianity.

AN IMPARTIALIST.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

We have considered our correspondent, Impartialist, as possessing great candour, and manifesting a disposition to reject error of every description; and on the presumption that we have not been mistaken in our opinion, we cherish a confident hope, that he will, on conviction, acknowledge and *reject* an *error*, which we believe he has unconsciously published. The error we allude to, is found in his *third* paragraph, when quoting Paul's Epistle to Titus, ii. 11. according to the *erroneous translation* of the *text*, without the *marginal* reading, which reading shows the scruples of conscience of the translators, who, although their *blindness* and prejudices prevailed on them to *corrupt* the *text*, still had influence sufficient to leave this standing memorial of their *doubts* and uncertainty relative to its *true import!* Our correspondent says, of the spirit of *infidelity*, "that it still leads from the manifestation of the Spirit, and *from* that 'grace of God which bringeth salvation, which hath appeared (not to an *elect few*, but) to all men: teaching," &c., and, "that no man knoweth the Father but the *Son*, and he to whom the Son revealeth him." And adds, "But this *infidel* Antichristian doctrine is very different,—it teacheth, that God is to be known through some *other* medium than Jesus Christ; namely,—*from* nature, *and from Scripture*," &c. Now, we request our correspondent to pause, to *stop*,—ask yourself, Where did I obtain this information? Am I sure, beyond the possibility of mistake, that I am right; and that the *spirit* that teaches *me*, is none other than the living God? Is it reasonable, or consistent, for you to adduce as *testimony* and evidence to prove that you are taught of God, or to prove any thing, a *book*, which you call *Scripture*, and deny that testimony when produced by *others*? You have quoted Scripture to prove that God has made himself known; and then, you *deny* the *testimony* of that Scripture, relative to what is made known! You say, "*infidelity* teacheth, that God is to be made known through some other medium than Jesus Christ; namely,—from nature, and from SCRIPTURE!" What are the Scriptures, but the *testimony of God?* Of that God, who *cannot lie!* Paul declared, Heb. i. 1. "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." Will you presume to say, that it is Christ, the *seed*, in every man's conscience, which is the *only word*, to which we are to give heed? The inspired penman declared, "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." How many words have proceeded from God? Paul says, 'God, who at sundry times, &c., spake,' &c. Did God speak at sundry times, &c., by his prophets, and by Christ, and did he not speak *words*, many words? Are not all these words good testimony? Are they not *life*, and are they not *recorded* in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments? Is a man an *infidel* who relies on these *words*, this 'record that God hath given of his Son,' and who believes '*this record*' is 'a *medium*' through which he can *know* God? John says, "The testimony of Jesus is the *Spirit* of prophecy!" Are not the Scriptures a record of this testimony, this Spirit of Prophecy? Is a man an INFIDEL who *relies* upon this *Spirit* of prophecy, this *testimony* of Jesus, and who considers it 'a medium' through which God is known? Christ declared, "Search the Scriptures, &c., they are they which testify of me." Is a man an *infidel* who *searches* these *Scriptures* and believes that they testify of Christ, and that their testimony is true? Again. Is not nature a manifestation of God? We taught at the commencement of our Numbers, the *incapacity* of man, in consequence of *blindness*, to

'Look through nature, up to nature's God.'

Heaven forbid we should ever accuse that man of *infidelity*, who considers, (and believes, too,) that the 'Heavens declare the glory of God,' or, that 'the *firmament* showeth forth his handy *work*;' for 'day unto day uttereth *speech*, and night unto night showeth *knowledge*!" But man, *impotent* from error, and ignorant by sin, too frequently neglects the book of nature altogether, or perverts its teaching. The *stars* bear brilliant testimony of the wisdom and power of God; and even the *earth*, CURSED as it is because of *man*, still *blushes* in the *rose*, *blooms* in its *foliage* and its *flowers*, produces *seed* to the sower, and bread to the eater, and abounds in unnumbered *sweets*. Deep in the dark recess of misanthropic gloom, and the black shades of Atheism itself, must that man be buried, who would deliberately deny these testimonies and manifestations of the power, wisdom, and goodness of God! Let us again look at our correspondent's premises. "The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, &c., not to a few elect." Now, Paul says no such thing; and we call upon all concerned to prove that he does. The grace of God, is the *love*, *favour*, *and kindness* of God. Paul does not declare, that this *love*, *or grace* of God, (which is *in*, and made known, or manifested *in* Christ Jesus) *hath* appeared unto *all* men! Very far from it. Paul says, the *grace* of God *hath appeared*, and he represents the *salvation of all men* as the *consequence; not* because the grace hath *appeared*, or is *made known* to any man, or men,—but he relates a *fact*,—*all men are saved*,—the *grace* of God which *saved them*, is made *known*. 'By grace are ye saved,' says Paul. Not saved *by* making it known; any more, than a man is *made rich*, by the *message* which the messenger delivers, when he tells him that he has a *fortune* bequeathed him, instead of being *made rich* by the *fortune itself*. We have been informed, that certain clergymen have said, that this paper was not of *sufficient consequence* to notice. Now, *our* exposition of Paul's declaration to Titus, *if* false, is in the strictest sense of the word a *damnable error*, and may be *read* by a *greater* number of persons than any clergyman's audience is composed of, consequently, *their plea*, 'no consequence,' disagrees widely with their *Sunday* professions of concern for the souls of poor sinners; who, we assure them, are as likely to be *injured* by reading *lies* in this *paper*, as they are to be *benefited* by hearing the *truth* from their *pulpits!* We ask them, seriously, How will you answer to your God, and Judge, at that great day which you say is rapidly approaching, for neglecting an opportunity of declaring what you pretend to believe is the 'whole counsel of God,' and *refuting*, what you in your pulpits call a *damnable heresy*, and declare, is the *destruction* of the souls of thousands? We mean no disrespect to you; but we think the subject important, far more so, than your opinions, reputations, or feelings; therefore, we use plainness of speech, and deal in honest sincerity proper for so great an occasion.—We, therefore, appeal to you, and ask you, as you expect to give account to God for your *conduct*—would you remain thus *inactive*, and *inattentive*, were your *salaries* in as great danger from the *promulgation* of the *faith we teach*, as you pretend the *souls* of men *are*?

Our correspondent, speaking of the *grace which hath appeared*, adds, 'not to an *elect few*,' but to all men.' We ask our correspondent, was there *news* received in town, or made known, or *appeared* in town, from England, and the inhabitants represented that *news* which they said had *appeared* to, or was made *known* to them, a *thousand different* ways, would you *believe* that *each* was *right*, and in the actual possession of the *news*, and that each had heard it from the *messenger* who brought it? No! It would be impossible for you to believe so! There is *news* received, or has *appeared* in this *world* from *heaven*; and there are thousands who pretend they have heard the news, or that it has appeared to them; and they tell a great many different stories about the news, and disagree widely in their accounts what the *news* is.

Now it is impossible *all* can be *right*—*one* account only of *all* can be *true*; the others must *all* be *false*. This is incontestable evidence, that the *grace* hath *not* appeared unto *all* men; for if it had, *all* men would *agree* in their accounts *of* that *grace*? You will please to recollect, that you have produced Paul, and *made* him testify to a *fact* which is *no* fact—and we deny that *Paul* ever *testified* that, which you impute to him. And more, we are ready, when called upon, to *prove* from the original Greek, that Paul did *not* say the '*grace* of God which bringeth salvation hath *appeared* to *all* men.' And we appeal to the consciences of all clergymen who are acquainted with the original, and to all others who are advertised of this fact, whether it is not their duty to make it known to their congregations, that they *may know the truth*, and receive it in the love of it. The doctrine recently taught in our columns by Philotheus, and Theophilus, and which Impartialist appears to have an inclination to advocate, is not found in the scriptures! Namely, *Christ is a light in every man's conscience, and this light is the true Christ, and is not found in the Scriptures.* Produce the man, who *never* saw, or heard of these scriptures, (which are so lightly esteemed,) who *ever* had *any* knowledge of God and Christ! *Dark*, indeed, must that pretended *light* be, which communicates no knowledge *of* God and Christ! We presume Philotheus, and Theophilus, are of the Society of Friends, and we mean no disrespect, when we say, that in our opinion, a congregation of 500, or 1000 persons, who sit silent for three hours, and not *one* of all this great number, and *all*, and each, professedly in possession of a Christ, the true light, have learned of that light, sufficient to bear testimony *of* that light. The Scriptures say, 'out of the *abundance* of the *heart* the *mouth speaketh*.' Please to acknowledge the truth of this declaration, and then the *reverse* must be *equally true*, namely—*an empty heart makes a silent mouth.* We repeat it—we mean no offence. Therefore, no man has a right to be offended! We consider the subject an all important one—our aim is to *refute error*, and *establish* the *truth*—and if we cannot *expose error*, or *vindicate* the *truth*, without giving offence, we shall *offend* all that will be offended! Reader, are you offended at our freedom? If so, we appeal, not to your prejudices, but to your conscience—Is it the manner, or the matter which offends? Remember the saying of the wise man,—'Better are the reproofs of a friend, than the kisses of an enemy!" We offer no violence to your person, or your reputation; neither do we seek to deprive you of any thing which can administer to your peace or happiness,—it is your prejudices and absurdities we war against,—we believe you are as good as any person of any sect, for we believe there are 'none good but one, and that is God." Admit the possibility that you are in an error—remember that truth is more precious than rubies; and that all things that are to be desired, are not to be compared with it,—consider, that the mind, like the body, may be diseased; and be not offended with him who would remove the film from the mental eye, because he gives necessary pain in the operation!

We agree with our correspondent, that it is 'the spirit of infidelity that leads man from the manifestation of the Spirit, (of God,) and from that grace which bringeth salvation,'—but we disagree with him when he says it 'has appeared, not to an *elect few*, but to all men.' Paul declares, Titus ii. 11. 'The grace of God hath appeared, which bringeth salvation to all men; teaching,' &c. And it is a spirit of unbelief or *infidelity*, which prevents men from believing that this *grace saves all men.* We wish to be understood We mean, prevents those from believing, who have the Scriptures which makes known the fact. Those who have never seen the scriptures, or heard of the resurrection of Christ, cannot *believe* what they know nothing about. Faith comes by *hearing*, and *hearing* by the *word* of God. To say that all men, without exception, have been in possession of the word of God, is giving the lie to experience, and to the Scriptures which speak of those who were '*without* God in the world.' And Paul declares, to the Ephes. i. 13. 'In whom ye also trusted *after* that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation.' Consequently, there was a time when *they* had *not* heard, and were *ignorant* of the *truth* or *word*. The *truth*, or word of salvation, by which the believing Ephesians were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, is recorded in the book called the Scriptures, and through their medium men arrive at the knowledge that Christ has saved them, which record is the truth, or gospel (news) of their salvation, and by believing it, they rejoice and enter into rest. It is declared of the Jews, that "their eyes should be darkened that they should not see." Can this grace appear to those who do not see? Again, Christ told the Jews, Matt. xxiii. 39. 'Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' Is this grace Christ? Have the Jews, to this day, said, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord?' If not, Has this grace appeared unto them? We presume there is no man who will deny, that the grace of God is his purpose of love and mercy; or that the word *appeared* is a convertible term, for made known, or manifested. Paul declared, see Ephes. i. 9. "Having made known unto us [it had appeared to Paul, &c.,] the mystery of his will (it had been a secret, not known, had not appeared) according to his good pleasure which he had purposed in himself." Paul in the 10th verse, tells what the mystery is which was made known or appeared to him,—the salvation of all men. And in the 12th verse, assigns as a reason why it was made known to him, and others, &c., 'That we should be to the praise of his glory, who *first* trusted in Christ.' James declares, see i. 18. 'Of his own will begat he us, with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of *first fruits* of his creatures." Here is a distinction (or election) made, which cannot by sophistry or cavilling be got over. It is not the doctrine of 'election and reprobation' taught by Calvin and Hopkins; it is as different as light is different from darkness. *First* fruits, imply *after* fruits; and the *after* fruits are expressed by the term, 'his creatures.' Paul declared to the Romans, see viii. 19. 'For the earnest expectation of the creature *waiteth* for the *manifestation* of the sons of God." How could it be said the creature waited, or waiteth, if that which is to be known, had already appeared to the creature? And Paul says, 23d verse, 'And not only *they*, but ourselves (who? Ans. Those to whom this *grace* had *appeared!*) also, which have the *first* fruits of the Spirit,' &c. See 21st verse. 'Because the creature (all men,—the whole creation,) itself also shall (not can, or may,) be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." The reader is informed, that the word in the *original*, translated *creature* in Romans viii. 19, 20, 21. is κτισις, and is the same word which is translated *creation*, in the 22d verse. This correction shows the harmony of the Scriptures,—The prophet declares, "All nations whom God hath made, shall come and worship before him," &c.; and Paul declares, the *creation* of God shall be delivered, &c. The *creation* was subjected in *hope*; and it is a hope which shall be swallowed up in certainty!

Here is a *death blow* to the doctrine of reprobation taught by Calvin and others. And when the *grace* of God *appears* to the *whole creation*, they will be delivered, &c., and not before! If the testimonies we have produced, are not sufficient to prove, that the '*grace* of God which (is the salvation of or) bringeth salvation to all men,' hath *not* appeared to *all* men, our opponents 'would *not* believe although one rose from the dead!'

Impartialist, in his *third* paragraph, speaking of Antichristian ministers, says, 'And hence, the necessary qualification is *not* that which *cleanseth* from all *sin*, to wit, *a confession* of a *gospel power in their souls*, which *is effectual to cleanse*,' &c. This is the first time we ever heard that a man's *confessing* that he had *a gospel power in his soul*, cleansed him from *all sin!* Now, if this is true, we believe the Antichristian ministers alluded to *are cleansed*; for they all *confess* this! We think our correspondent, to use a common expression, *has overshot his mark.* In our opinion, the *truth* would do much better here. Look at it.—'But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us *wisdom*, and *righteousness*, and *sanctification*, and *redemption*; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory *in the Lord*.' 1 Cor. i. 30, 31. Not glory in the gospel power in *our* souls.

The observations of Impartialist relative to *mis-*

sionaries, are we think in want of a little qualification. Now we have no hesitation in saying, that we believe numbers have relinquished the sweets of domestic, and all the pleasures and gratifications of social life, and the blessings arising from civilized society, and with a motive highly honourable to humanity, voluntarily encountered the deprivations and sufferings inseparable from a wandering life among savages, in wilds, and countries, where no human eye pitied, and no human hand was stretched forth for their defence, or to administer to their pressing wants and necessities. And ignorant indeed, must that man be, who would *confine* the exercise of *self-denial* to those professing the name of Christians! With a *zeal* as ardent, a *faith* as strong, and a *perseverance* as irresistible, have those who were ignorant of God, and Christ, and immersed in all the errors of Pagan superstition and idolatry, evinced their *sincerity* in the *cause* they were engaged; and amidst racks and torments sealed their testimony with *their blood!* A solution for all this difficulty may be found in *physical causes;* and the increased *powers* of *body*, and *energy* of *mind*, of *insane* persons, is a simple *effect* proceeding from a natural *cause*, and not, as ignorant, or superstitious people imagine, the effect of a *supernatural* cause. The many *impious*, *disgusting*, and *disgraceful* scenes, which have been witnessed at *Methodist camp-meetings*, may be easily accounted for, without supposing any influence but their own passions, or any god but the idol which vanity has erected in their bosoms. "The living and true God, who is the Saviour of all men, is a God of order, and not of confusion!" And to attribute to his Spirit, conduct as riotous, and confusion as great, as existed at Ephesus, when the worshippers of Diana, alarmed by the peaceful preaching of Paul, shouted the glory of their goddess, is blasphemous to the last degree; and the declaration of the Saviour of the world, that his Spirit, the Comforter, *when* he came, 'should testify of *him*,' is incontestable evidence that this Spirit, which testifies of the *gracious* affections and goodness of the creature, never came from Christ. It is, however, due to the Methodist connexion, to acknowledge, that the rational and sincere among them deprecate this riotous shouting, and howling, and lament in a becoming manner, the errors which have crept into their worship since the days of the justly celebrated founder of their sect.

We, therefore, are of the opinion, that a marked distinction should be made between missionaries, who from a principle of duty, and a concern for the souls of their brethren, perform in their own persons the work, and bear in reality the heat and burden of their day, and those, who *lolling* in their *easy chairs, or swimming in luxury and fattening in idleness*, and who, in the expressively prophetic words of Christ, 'Bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and *lay them on men's shoulders*, but *they themselves will not move them* with one of their fingers; but all *their works* they do, for to be *seen of men*.' Matt. xxiii. 4, 5. It is arrant hypocrisy, for a clergyman to pretend that millions of his brethren are going to *hell-fire* for want of dollars to save them, and with crocodile tears, to beg of his congregation, or others who come within his spunging *influence*, the fruits of their labour, and himself, better able than nine out of ten of those whom he addresses, remain in the back ground and not lift a finger. There is not a missionary beggar in the City of New-York, but could subsist his family, and supply them with all the *necessaries* of life for *six hundred dollars a year;* and were they to do this, they would fare far better than their Lord and Master, whose steps they *pretend* to walk in, and who had not where to lay his head.* And were they paid as the Apostle Paul was, in *quality*, and *quantity*, 39 *stripes*, instead of 39 *hundred dollars*, we think the order would lose its reputation in the eyes of *some* persons, and the number of its incumbents grow less. Should these remarks meet the eyes of some of our *missionary beggars*, we ask them, and we press it home too, to 'their business and bosoms,'—According to your *rule* of judging, what does that man deserve, who professes great concern for the souls of poor sinners,—declaring, that his *heart bleeds* for them, and who, while urging the duty of *giving (to save souls,)* to men of families, whose incomes do not amount to $1000 per year, a *part* of *their* earnings, should himself squander in *his own* family, a sum exceeding $2,500 per year,—and all this, when dollars would go far to save souls, and millions were perishing? Would he deserve heaven, or,——Again. Is a man consistent, who knows by *experience*, that even a *small* family *cannot* be subsisted for *one year*, for a *less* sum than $2,500, or even *for* that *sum*, is *he* consistent to urge men who have not *one half* that income to give *their* money, and, if *his statement is true*, subject *their* families to *greater* suffering as a consequence? We say *greater* suffering, for *cause* and *effect* ar euniform, and never *vary* to accommodate the prejudices, the falsehoods, or the truth of any person. Consequently, if a Doctor of Divinity cannot subsist *his family* FOR $2,500, a mechanic, or tradesman's family of equal numbers, would absolutely *starve*, or *beg*, before the *year* was *out*, on less than *one half the sum!* Now, this is just as plain, as that two and two make four. And if there was *truth* in the *premises*, it would follow as a *consequence*, that there would be *truth* in the *conclusions!!!*

* According to *orthodox data*, the missionary beggars in the United States, squander every year a sum of money sufficient to save at a moderate calculation, on *their principle*, TEN THOUSAND SOULS, from *endless misery!* And all this, reader, while their '*hearts* are *bleeding* for poor sinners.' How would this read in history?

Note. Impartialist, see 133d page, col. 3. 4th and 5th lines from top, says, 'They would fain make people believe, that salvation is *through them*, and the *word of God* (the Scriptures,) or why do they hold up an idea that souls will be lost for the want of such *assistance*." Now, we believe, that salvation is 'through the word of God;' but we do not believe clergymen can make that word *effectual* to save a soul from endless misery, which would *not be effectual* without them. This appears to be Impartialist's meaning. On the whole, however, we think there is *little choice in error*. And a preacher, whether he is a Calvinist, or Arminian, or known by the appellation of Baptist, Methodist, Congregationalist, Friend, or Quaker, except he preaches an *Unconditional* and *Universal salvation*, which God and his prophets and apostles preached, in the impressive language of Scripture, we say, '*Let him be accursed!!!*'

For the Gospel Herald.

On Conditions in Salvation.

I have seen the three following incredible tenets or paradoxes. 1st, That all men were saved from all sin by Jesus Christ, who came for this purpose 1820 years ago; and finished what he came to do. 2d. That he drew all men, (past, present, and to come,) unto him, when he was lifted up on the cross, where they and we were crucified with him, afterwards were buried with him, and then rose with him, ascended with him into heaven, and now sit with him *in heavenly places, in Christ Jesus*." And 3d, and consequently, there is now no such thing as a *condition* in the salvation of any man. As the believers in *conditional* salvation are told, that it is impossible for them to bring *one* Scriptural proof to support their doctrine of conditional salvation, I propose to note a few passages which prove it to my satisfaction. How the external advent of Jesus, redeemed the external Jews from the outward covenant and sins against its laws, has been explained by Theophilus.

That the outward salvation and prosperity of the external Jews, as well as their captivity and punishment, were conditional, is proved by Deut. xxvii. 9 to 26. xxviii. 1, 15, 58. where we may read the blessings for obedience, and the curses for disobedience. Such was the old covenant as is proved by Deut. xxix. 9, 12, 25. xxx. 15, 16, 17, 18. Indeed conditions are to be found from Genesis to Malachi. Death was the condition annexed to eating the forbidden fruit, Genesis ii. 17. Cain was told, 'If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted? If thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." We see also, conditions in 2 Chron. vii 12 to 22. where the Lord said to Solomon, "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves and pray and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven and forgive their sin," &c. We may see the condition of salvation and reprobation stated in Prov. i. 20 to 33. ii. 1 to 5. where we may see that if we turn to God at the reproof of his wisdom, he will pour out his Spirit upon us. But if we set at nought all his counsel and despise all his reproofs, he will laugh at our calamity, and will mock when our fear cometh. Nineveh would have been destroyed in forty days, as Jonah prophesied, if they had remained impenitent. In Malachi ii. 2. reprobation is proved to be conditional: and in chap. iii. benedictions are grounded on conditions. verse 10.

In the writings, also under the new covenant, or evangelical dispensation, conditions are frequently mentioned and generally understood. Thus in Mat. iii. 7 to 12. Luke xiii. 1 to 5. we are taught that repentance is a necessary condition to avoid the wrath to come. By Mat. v. Christ evidently requires more from us under his dispensation, than was required from the Jews under the Mosaical dispensation. And by the conclusion of Christ's sermon, Mat. vii. 21 to 29. we are informed that those are lost, who hear Christ's words, but do not obey them. They who hear and obey are likened to them who build their houses upon a rock. Indeed *faith* is a principal condition in salvation. Jesus could not do many miracles in some places, because *faith* was wanting in the people. To one he said, 'be it unto thee according to thy *faith*.' To another, 'thy *faith* has saved thee, go in peace.' Mark xvi. 16. Luke vii. 50. In John xii. 36. Jesus said, believe in the *light* that ye may be the children of *light*. 46th verse. I am come a light into the world 44th verse. He that believeth on me, believeth on him that sent me. We are told in John iii. 18. 'he that believeth on him is not condemned, he that believeth not, is condemned already.' 36th verse. 'he that believeth not in the Son shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.' It is evident by John i. 11 to 13. that Jesus came to his own, (the Jewish people,) but his own received him not, (a few excepted;) but as many as received him, and believed on his name, to them gave he power, (or the right and privilege) to become the sons of God. And these were born not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God." This new birth is insisted on by Jesus Christ, in John iii. 3, 5, 6, 11. as an indispensable condition of salvation. By the parable of the sower, Luke viii. 1 to 18. we are taught conditions of salvation; and who were saved by the seed sown, and who were not. The light of salvation, according to verse 16, is to shine and be improved by man, lest the light which he seemeth to have be taken from him. See also Mat. xiii. 12. Luke xi. 33, 36. That self-denial, taking up the cross and following the light, Jesus Christ, are necessary conditions of salvation, are proved by Mat. x. 38. Luke ix. 23, 24. xviii. 22 Luke xiv 33. By the fig tree, Luke xiii. 6. we are taught that we must be fruitful in the works of the Holy Spirit, or expect to be cut off from salvation. Mat vii. 19. says, 'Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." When one asked Jesus if few were saved, he answered, '*strive* to enter in at the strait gate, for many shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able" See Mat. vii. 14, 21, 22. Luke xiii. 24 to 28. By the parables of the ten virgins, of the talents, and of the pounds, Luke xix. 11 to 18. Mat. xx. 1 to 30. we are instructed, concerning the conditions, the nature of salvation, and condemnation. The oil, talents, and pounds, evidently mean God's *Spirit* or grace. Christ, speaking of this Spirit, says, in John vii. 38. he that believeth, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. In John iv. 14. Jesus taught the woman of Samaria the same doctrine. By chap. vi 35. Jesus said unto them, 'I am the bread of life,' 53d verse, 'except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.'

By these texts, it appears that our salvation is conditional on the drinking of living water, and on the eating of the bread of life. Again, John xv. 1 to 6, incontrovertibly proves, that salvation and bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit depend upon our abidance in Christ the vine. And this abi-

dance denotes the *power* (or free agency in such as have received Christ the life ;) *power* to become the sons of God, or children of the light. I will now conclude for the present; after observing, that as the law shadowed the things under the gospel, Heb. x. 1, and as I have proved that *conditions* were in the *law*-dispensation,—hence it follows, that the conditions of the law typified the conditions of the gospel.

C———, of New Jersey.

ANSWER.

That the *truth* should appear *incredible* to an *unbeliever*, is, of all things, the reverse of being a *paradox*, or *incredible* to us! The *three incredible* things, which our correspondent speaks of, and which to him are *paradoxes*, are not of our invention—namely, '*First*, that *all men* were *saved* from *all sin* by Jesus Christ, who came for this purpose 1820 years ago, and finished what he came to do. *Second*—that he *drew all men* (past, present, and to come,) unto him when he was lifted up on the cross, where they, and we, were *crucified* with him; were afterwards *buried* with him, and *rose* with him, *ascended* with him into heaven, and now sit with him in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. And, *Third*, and consequently, there is now no such thing as a *condition* in the *salvation* of any man.' When Paul preached the doctrine of the *resurrection* to unbelievers in Athens, they *mocked* him; and if the eloquence of Paul, assisted by the Divine wisdom enlightening his mind, and inspiring his tongue, failed of convincing, we may with great reason expect to be *mocked*, or disbelieved in our feeble attempts to teach; for God alone can give light to the blind understanding, or faith to the unbelieving heart. Reader, there is, in our opinion, nothing *incredible* with God, that can be effected by *almighty power*, designed by *infinite wisdom*, and is agreeable to *unbounded goodness*. We, therefore, believe all God has *revealed*—all that his *goodness* can *desire*—*wisdom plan*—and *power execute!* God said,—'All souls are mine.' Paul, 'For we *know* (not we guess, or we suppose) that the *whole creation* groaneth and travaileth in pain *together* until now.' Quere. How could the *whole* creation travail *together*, if the *whole* creation did not *exist together*? David says, 'All nations whom thou *hast* (in the past tense) made shall come and worship,' &c.—And, 'all the ends of the world shall remember,' (in the future tense.) Quere. How could they *remember*, if they had not *forgot*? Again, Paul says, 'For all things *were* (in the past tense) made by him, and for him.' Quere. If the *soul* [which constitutes the man, the body is only a case for the soul] of millions are to be made, or produced by God, in the *future* tense, what propriety or truth was there in the declaration, that *all* things *were* in the *past* tense made by him? Again, Paul declares, 'Be it known unto you, that Christ is the *head* of every man—if *one member* suffers, *all the members* suffer with it—*we* [who? Ans. All men] were crucified *with* him, buried *with* him, and have risen *with* him.' And Christ declared, that he came, not to 'judge the *world*, but to *save* the *world*; [not a *part* of the world] and *finished* the work he came to do.' Quere. How could the work be *finished*, unless the world was saved? Again,—'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men [not a part] unto me.' Paul declared. Ephes. ii. 4 to 9 verses. 'But God, who *is* rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together *with* Christ, [When was Christ quickened?] by grace are ye saved. [Quere. Is *grace*, and *gift*, synonymous with *conditional*?] And hath [in the past tense] raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus. That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus. [Where is the condition in Christ?] For by *grace* are ye saved through faith, and that *not* of *yourselves*, it is the gift of God. *Not of works*, [conditions] lest any man should boast.' Now we think it *more incredible* that all these testimonies should be *false*, than that C. of New Jersey should be *mistaken*!

If the passages C. has quoted, prove salvation to be conditional, to *his* satisfaction, we think he is of all *fools* the *greatest*, if he does not *comply* with *the conditions!* And we further say, if you 'are *justified* by the *law*, you are *fallen* from grace.' The salvation of *our* God is *free*—unmerited—a *gift*—without money, and without price!

We inform C. that Theophilus, instead of *explaining*, as he declares, the *outward covenant*, as he calls it, knew nothing about it! If this is questioned, please to read our *answer*, in Numbers 29, 30, and 31. We request C. to look at Number 15, 60 page, 1 col. last paragraph, and he will see the '*sine qua non*.' We have but one objection, however, to examine every passage quoted, and their connexions; and that is, the occupying our columns with matter, equal to 50 octavo pages, to the exclusion of the favours of our correspondents. *We challenge him to produce* ONE *passage from the Scriptures, as above mentioned*, see 15 Number, &c. His assertions, whatever weight they may have in his *own* opinion, have *none* in *ours*. We repeat it—the *condition* must be plainly stated—*endless happiness*, if *complied* with; and *endless misery* if *neglected!* The opinion, or declarations, of C. are in our estimation, when in opposition to the Scriptures, *good for nothing!* Our readers have seen satisfactory answers and expositions of many of the passages alluded to in our columns already; and we shall answer as many as are presented in a proper manner, agreeably to our promise, in our 15th Number. Our correspondent will better understand us, when we, in imitation of his own manner, tell him, that the whole Bible is destitute of conditions, and this is proved to *our* satisfaction. And we add. If he will conform to our *sine qua non*, we shall try to prove it to his, and *not without!*

The concluding sentence of C. 'And as *I have proved* that conditions were *in* the *law-dispensation*, hence it follows, that the conditions of the *law*, typified the conditions of the *gospel*.' We have always considered the *law* as conditional altogether. But, that *his* proving conditions in the *law*, should make it follow, that there are conditions in the *gospel*, is, of all logic, the strangest we ever heard of. Now we have understood that the *law*, and its *types*, had their *fulfilment* in *Christ*—and Christ declared, 'The law and the prophets were until John, since which time the kingdom of God is preached,' &c. Paul described the '*law*, as the *shadow* of *good things* to come;' how [according to C.] the *temporal* penalty under the law, can be the *type*, or shadow of an *endless* penalty, damnation and misery without end, under the gospel, and according to Paul be a *good thing*, requires greater abilities to show, than we think is possessed by 'C. of New Jersey!'

UNIVERSALISM.

As an objection to the doctrine of Universalism, we frequently hear it said, 'that it will do to live by, but not to die by.' To the *first* part of this assertion we very willingly assent, as it is not only reasonable but scriptural. The scriptures inform us that 'the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared, teaching us, that, denying ungodliness and every worldly lust, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, &c.' But the last part of this assertion borders upon that system of detraction and deceit to which our opposers generally resort, when reason and revelation fail of supporting their unscriptural hypothesis. What will give a person support and comfort when on a death bed? Ans. To have assurance of eternal life and happiness. Well, if a person sincerely believes the doctrine of Universalism, he must of course consider himself an heir of grace, and consequently, feeling sure of his eternal happiness, falls asleep in Jesus perfectly composed. Now it will be seen, that it would be talking NONSENCE, to say such doctrine will not do to die by. It is a fact, that there is nothing which will give the support, in a dying hour, which a belief in the doctrine of Universalism will.

This is a truth which no candid man will deny. Our opposers will now be obliged to move the position of the argument, and probably will say, that the doctrine leaves the person when on his death bed. Well, then it appears that he does not die a Universalist; how then can it be told, that the doctrine will not do to die by? The assertion cannot be supported. Suppose, for instance, that the person recant his sentiments, and be brought to rejoice in the salvation of a part of mankind only; if this belief gives him joy, it cannot be for any thing but the salvation of those whom he believes are saved; whereas, if he believed in 'the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began,' he would 'rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.'

ALEXIS.

Boston U. Magazine.

LICENTIOUS UNIVERSALISM.

The *New-York Daily Advertiser*, of the 15th and 16th November, contains an account of the city of Housa, discovered in the interior of Africa by a modern traveller; who describes this city to be about the size of London,—the inhabitants, generally, to be *honest, benevolent, and charitable*; and robberies not more frequent than in some other countries, &c. But, wonderful to relate, 'They believe in the immortality of the soul, and that both men and women go to paradise; that there is *no future punishment*; the wicked are punished in *this* world. Happiness after death, consists in being in the *presence of God*!' Now, this account, to be consistent with the conclusions of our *pious good folks*, who believe in the *beauty and necessity* of *endless misery*, should have described this huge city of *licentious* and *profane Universalists*, as a race of *cut-throats, swimming in sin*, and *wallowing* in every species of *crime* and *depravity!!!*

ANOTHER SACRIFICE OFFERED TO MOLOCH!

"A woman lately cut her throat near Rockingham, under the conviction that she was an object of Divine wrath, and would not be saved. Her character was respectable, and she lived with her husband and family in great domestic comfort."

Boston Palladium.

Calvinism, these are *thy* FRUITS! The *accursed tree* is known—and the *truth*, like a *worm* at the *root*, shall wither its branches and destroy it for ever!

OLD TIMES.

"Do not *affect* the *gentleman*. You have no more to do with this character than with that of a *dancing-master*. A Preacher of the gospel should be the *servant of all!* Be ashamed of nothing but sin: not of fetching wood, or drawing water, if time permit, nor of cleaning your *own shoes*, or those of your *neighbours!*"

Wesley's advice to a minister.

Quere.—To *be* a gentleman, and only *affect* to be one, are *two* things.

PROVERBS i. 27.

'And your *destruction* cometh as a whirlwind.' Does God destroy them? Ans. See the 32d verse, 'For the turning away of the *simple* shall *slay* them, and the *prosperity* of *fools shall destroy* them!' *Wisdom* will laugh at *folly*,—but God will never *sport* with the sufferings of his creatures. "He will *not* cast off for ever; but out of the multitude of his mercies he will have compassion, for he doth *not* afflict willingly, (unnecessarily) nor *grieve* the children of men." 33d verse. 'But whoso hearkeneth unto me (wisdom) shall dwell safely, and shall be quiet from fear of evil.' In 23d verse, it is declared,—'Turn you at my reproof: Behold, *I will pour out my Spirit unto you*, I will make known my words *unto you!*' Is this conditional? If so, produce the condition! 'How long ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorners delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge? Turn you at my reproof!'

To Correspondents.

Impartialist, and Edward Sharman, Springfield, N. J. are received. In E. S. former communication, Number 22. the name was misprinted, *Harman*, &c.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1820. NO. 34.

Communications.

ANSWER TO POTHOS.

Mr. Editor,—I am unwilling that the inquiry made in your last, relative to the genealogical accounts of our Saviour, as given in the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, should go unanswered; and yet to give them a satisfactory reply, may perhaps be attended with some difficulty.

That these accounts were not intended to be literal accounts of the genealogy of Christ, as of the lineage of David, is evident from the discrepancy between them, not only as it respects the number of generations between David, and Joseph the husband of Mary, but also as it respects the persons through whom his lineage is traced; there being, as is mentioned by your correspondent, but twenty-five, of whom the names are given in Matthew's account from David to Joseph, and not less than forty, in St. Luke's. Both these accounts profess to give the genealogy of Christ through Joseph, for they both terminate in him; nor can it, as I conceive, by any possibility, be made out, that the one is designed to give us the lineage of Joseph, and the other of Mary. Besides, of what possible use to give us the lineage of Joseph? For it is not only admitted, but often made the subject of proof and argument, that Christ was not the son of Joseph. Disclaiming, then, all idea of attempting the explanation of this subject in the ordinary way, (I mean the way of the learned, who have only rendered confusion more dark and intricate) permit me to offer for the consideration of your correspondent and readers, a different explanation.

There are but two ways in which this subject can possibly be considered. These accounts are either *literal* accounts of the lineage of Christ, or they are *spiritual*. For that the word of God is of *spiritual* as well as of *literal* interpretation, is plain, not only from what Christ himself says, 'My words are spirit and they are life,' but also from the declaration of the apostle, that 'the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive.' That they are *not* literal accounts, needs I think no further proof. For if any one can suppose that two accounts differing so essentially from each other as these do, and both professing to prove the same thing, the lineal descent of Christ from David, are *literally true*, I should deem all arguments with such a mind entirely useless. If then, they are not *literal* accounts of this circumstance, they must be *spiritual*. And then the object of our inquiry will be, how they are to be spiritually understood.

The spiritual interpretation of the Scriptures as the same is usually made, is very vague and indeterminate. Every interpreter is left to his own choice of meaning, and there must of course be as many spiritual meanings to doubtful and obscure passages, as there are various sects, or different articles of belief; for every such passage must, if necessary, be made to harmonize with the views of the particular commentator. So that it would seem there is a necessity for some *certain rule* which should be general and universal, by which the true spiritual meaning of the Scriptures can be made out; a rule that shall be applicable, not to one particular part only, of the sacred writings, but to the whole. A key that shall unlock the treasures of Divine knowledge, and bring to light the spirit and life of this Holy book. Your readers, perhaps, may some of them be startled at the mention of such a key, and be ready to ask, who is to give it to us, and how are we to know whether it be a true key or not? Should any of your readers have a casket in which he was informed there were concealed vast treasures, and the only obstacle to his possession of those treasures, was the want of a key to unlock the casket, would he, when some kind hand offered him a key, which he was assured would unlock his treasures, would he, I say, stop to inquire who was the maker of this key, before he applied it to the casket? Would he not rather hasten to make the experiment, and see whether it would open his treasure? Even so try this key to the spiritual meaning of the Scriptures, and see whether it will open it or no. If it will, then it must be a true key. If it will not, of course it must be a false one.

The Gospel of St. Matthew begins as follows: 'The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.' Now this is not literally true. For literally speaking, Christ is not the son of David. Nor is David literally speaking the son of Abraham. David, it is true, was the descendant of Abraham, but not his son. And that Christ was not the son of David, in the sense we have been accustomed to consider him, is proved by his own words. This I think is the obvious conclusion from that remarkable question, which he put to the scribes on this very subject. 'And Jesus answered and said, while he taught in the temple, How say the scribes that Christ is the son of David? For David himself said, by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. David therefore himself called him Lord, and whence is he his son?'

We have said that their accounts can only be reconciled and made consistent, by considering them spiritually. Now, by considering them spiritually, I mean, that in these accounts, we are not to consider that they detail historically the descent of Christ from David according to the flesh, but we are to consider them as detailing in series the descent of the Divine truth, from highest to lowest principles, from God into nature. Christ was the Word made flesh, consequently, the Divine truth in ultimates or in its lowest degree. For the Word is divine truth, and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. But this divine truth in its descent from God, or from its highest principles, must necessarily pass through various accommodated states, until its manifestation in the world. Divine truth, in itself, is always one and the same, but it presents itself to the several orders of intelligences in states of accommodation, that is, veiled according to the degrees of their intelligence. Thus truth as presented to the angels of the third or highest heaven, may be called *celestial;* as presented to the angels of the second or middle heaven, *spiritual;* and as presented to the angels of the first or lower heaven, *celestial and spiritual natural;* and as presented to men on earth, merely *natural*. Yet men here on earth are capable of having their minds so elevated as to perceive truth in all its various degrees. In agreement with this view, we find in the account given by St. Matthew, that there are three several stages or gradations in general, by which the descent of the Divine truth is distinguished, the first is from Abraham to David, which are reckoned fourteen generations; the second from David until the carrying away into Babylon, which are also reckoned fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ, which also are reckoned fourteen generations. Now, these three larger divisions correspond to and represent the three degrees of truth as it existed in the Lord Jesus Christ, from his inmost or highest, to his outermost or lowest principles. In other words, the first period or the generations from Abraham to David, represent the Lord's inmost or celestial man, the second his inner or spiritual man, and the third his outer or natural man, corresponding to the three heavenly states. Of course then, all the generations from Abraham to David, relate and have respect to Divine truth in its descent through the celestial degree. All the generations from David to the carrying away into Babylon to the descent of the Divine truth through the spiritual degree. And from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ, all the generations relate and have respect to its descent through the natural degree. In which degree taking to itself in the womb of the Virgin the natural principles it was born into the world. This was the descending scale, or the descent of the Divine truth from its first into its lowest principles; the ascending scale or the return of this Divine truth to first principles, is the glorification of the humanity, or the union of the human with the Divine nature, whereby the human also became Divine; this is what our Lord alludes to when he says, 'I am come forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world and I go to the Father.'

The genealogy according to Luke, is of the same nature with that of St. Matthew, for they are both written, not on account of the literal relation, but on account of the spiritual truths they were intended to communicate, to wit, the descent of the Divine truth on earth. Any variation therefore in the account by St. Luke, or any additional names, cannot in the least alter the fact. For as the literal sense in this case is merely a description of the quality of this truth in its various degrees of descent, from the Divine through the heavens, until its final manifestation on the earth, any name (name signifying quality) mentioned in St. Luke, and not to be found in Matthew, will be considered only a more minute designation of this quality. Thus (by way of illustration) if twenty-five generations only be given by Matthew, while Luke gives forty, this only shows the account of Luke to contain a more minute expression of quality.

Should these remarks be deemed not sufficiently satisfactory by your correspondent, and I can hardly flatter myself they will be fully satisfactory, because I have not entered at large upon the subject, I shall be happy to afford him such further information as I may be able; or at least to point him to a source, where he may investigate the subject at his leisure.

J. C.

Nov. 5, 1820.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Sir,—Enclosed I send you the far-famed specimen of Welch preaching, which has travelled pretty briskly through the American papers, and may therefore be presumed to have some claim to modern orthodoxy. It is not, indeed, very wonderful, that such fustian should find admirers, for the commentator, Scott, testifies to the truth, when he says, 'A very small proportion of men's actions are directed by personal knowledge, demonstration, or even by the higher degrees of probability.' This fact, alone, accounts for the wide circulation of a production, replete with national vanity, and *clerical jargon*.

"At a meeting of ministers at Bristol, the reverend Mr.——— invited several of his brethren to sup with him; among them was the minister officiating at the Welch meeting house in that city. He was an entire stranger to all the company, and silently attentive to the general conversation of his brethren. The subject on which they were discoursing, was the different strains of public preaching. When many gave their opinion, and had mentioned some individuals as good preachers, and such as were models as to the style of composition, &c. Mr. ——— turned to the Welch stranger, and solicited his opinion. He said he felt it to be a *privilege* to be *silent* when such men were *discoursing;* but that he felt it a duty to comply with this request. But," said he, "If I must give my opinion, I should say that you have no good preachers in England." 'No!' said Mr. L. 'No, said

he; 'that is, I mean no such preachers as we have in the principality.' 'I know,' said Mr. L. 'you are famous for jumping in Wales, but that is not owing, I suppose, so much to the strain of preaching which the people hear, as to the enthusiasm of their characters.' 'Indeed,' said the Welchman, '*you* would jump too, if you heard and understood such preaching.' 'Why,' said Mr. L. 'do you not think I could make them jump, if I were to preach to them?' 'You make them jump!' exclaimed the Welchman, 'you make them jump! A Welchman would set fire to the world, while you were lighting your match.' The whole company became very much interested in this new turn of the subject, and unanimously requested the good man to give them some specimen of the style and manner of preaching of the principality. 'Specimen,' said he, 'I cannot give; if John Elias was here, he would give a specimen *indeed*. Oh! John Elias is a great preacher.' 'Well,' said the company, 'give us something that you have heard from him.' 'Oh no!' said he, 'I cannot do justice to it,—beside, do you understand the Welch language?' They said 'no, not so as to follow a discourse.' 'Then' said he, 'it is impossible for ye to understand, if I were to give you a specimen.' 'But, said they, 'cannot you put it into English?' 'Oh!' said he, 'your poor meagre language would spoil it; it is not capable of expressing those ideas which a Welchman can conceive; I cannot give you a specimen in English without spoiling it.' The interest of the company was increased, and nothing would do but something of a specimen, while they promised to make every allowance for the language.

'"Well,' said the Welchman, 'If you must have a piece, I must try, but I don't know what to give you. I do not recollect a piece of John Elias; he is our best preacher. I must think a little: well 'I recollect a piece of Christmas Evans. Christmas Evans was a good preacher, and I heard him a little time ago, at an association of ministers. He was preaching on the depravity of man by sin,—of his recovery by the death of Christ; and he said, 'brethren, if I were to represent to you in a figure, the condition of man as a sinner, and the means of his recovery by the cross of Jesus Christ, I should represent it somewhat in this way. Suppose a large graveyard surrounded by a high wall, with only one entrance which is by a large iron gate, which is *fast bolted;* within these walls are thousands and tens of thousands of human beings, of all ages and of all classes, by one epidemic disease bending to the grave,—the grave yawns to swallow them, and they must all die—there is no balm to relieve them—no physician there—they *must* perish. This is the condition of man as a sinner—all, all have sinned, and the soul that sinneth it shall die. While man was in this deplorable state, *Mercy*, the darling attribute of Deity, came down and stood at the gate, looked at the scene and wept over it, exclaiming, 'Oh! that I might enter; I would bind up their wounds—I would relieve their sorrows—I would save their souls!' While Mercy stood weeping at the gate, an embassy of angels, commissioned from the court of heaven to some other world, passing over, paused at the sight, and heaven forgave that pause; and seeing Mercy standing there, they cried, 'Mercy, Mercy, can you not enter? Can you look upon this scene and not pity? Can you pity and not relieve?' Mercy replied, 'I can see;' and in her tears she added, 'I can pity, but I cannot relieve.' 'Why can you not enter?' 'Oh!' said Mercy, 'Justice has barred the gate against me, and I cannot, must not unbar it.' At this moment, Justice himself appeared, as it were to watch the gate. The angels inquired of him, 'Why will you not let Mercy in?' Justice replied, 'My law is broken, and it must be honoured. Die *they* or *justice* must!' At this, there appeared a form among the angelic band, like unto the Son of God, who, addressing himself to Justice, said, 'What are thy demands?' Justice replied, 'My terms are stern and rigid. I must have sickness for their health—I must have ignominy for their honour—I must have death for life.'—'*Without shedding of blood there is no remission.*' 'Justice,' said the Son of God, 'I accept thy terms. On me be this wrong, and let Mercy enter.' 'When,' said Justice, 'will you perform this promise? Jesus replied, four thousand years hence, upon the hill of Calvary, without the gates of Jerusalem, I will perform it in my own person.' The deed was prepared and signed in the presence of the angels of God. Justice was satisfied; and Mercy entered preaching salvation in the name of Jesus. The deed was committed to the patriarchs, by them to the kings of Israel and the prophets; by them it was preserved until Daniel's seventy weeks were accomplished. Then, at the appointed time, Justice appeared on the hill of Calvary, and Mercy presented to him the important deed. 'Where,' said Justice, 'is the Son of God?' Mercy answered, 'behold him at the bottom of the hill, bearing his own cross; and then she departed, and stood aloof at the hour of trial. Jesus ascended the hill, while in his train followed his weeping church. Justice immediately presented them with the deed, saying, 'This is the day when this bond is to be executed.' When he received it, did he tear it in pieces, and give it to the winds of heaven? No, he nailed it to his cross, exclaiming, 'it is finished.' Justice called on Holy fire to come down and consume the sacrifice. Holy fire descended—it swallowed his humanity, but when it touched his Deity it expired! and there was darkness over the whole heavens: but, 'glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will to men.'

'This,' said the Welchman, 'this is but a poor specimen of Christmas Evans.'

London Jewish Expositor.

On reading the foregoing 'specimen,' the following propositions are considered as fairly deducible from it:

1st. All men are sinners; and as the soul that sinneth *shall* die, they are without hope; for, 'die *they* or *justice* must.'

2d. *Mercy*, the DARLING attribute of Deity, wept over the scene, but could only pity, not relieve from the denunciation of *vindictive justice*.

3d. A mediator interferes, and *vindictive justice* is satisfied by a *something else* than the threatened penalty. The *sine qua non* is *dispensed* with, and,

4th. The law being well satisfied with the *substitute*, the penalty is abrogated, and (for aught that appears,)the preacher is ready to join issue with the Scriptures in the final happiness of all men.

By the Scriptures we understand, 'that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being freely justified by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus' This is so similar to the last verse of the 6th chapter of Romans, that the same inference must be drawn from each. 'The wages of sin is death, BUT the gift of God is eternal life.' Thus all have sinned—all are justified.—The soul that sinneth shall die---*true*---but what is this death? To be carnally minded is *death*, says the apostle. And again---the carnal mind is enmity against God, is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be; but the light of life can destroy the darkness of the carnal mind---the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent, is the gift of God, and, by the declaration of our Saviour, ETERNAL LIFE.

Die they *or justice must*, is a tradition of man. Every sinner *does* assuredly *die, in the full sense of Scripture;* but the *addition*, though it answers very well for *poetry*, is neither in the letter nor spirit of Scripture. *Justice* requires us to love the Lord our God with all the heart; and our neighbour as ourselves; and, says our Saviour, 'On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.' Here, then, is the 'end of the law;' and, says Jesus, 'I came,not to destroy the law nor the prophets,but to *fulfil*.' And again—'one jot nor tittle of the law shall not pass away, until all be fulfilled.'

2d How it comes about that the claims of *vindictive justice* are so sacred, that the efforts of the *darling* attribute of Deity---*Mercy*, are made in vain, is for those to answer, who desire 'to be teachers of the law, not knowing what they say, nor whereof they affirm;' and a *rational* answer will be given, when it can be shown how two can walk together unless they agree---and, how a being can be proved *perfect*, whose attributes *clash*,—'And with one attribute another wound.'

3d. The declarations of Scripture are positive. 'The soul that sinneth shall die,' but from this death there is a recovery, or every human being is entirely cut off; for *all have sinned*, and, as saith the inspired penman, 'so death passed upon all men.' Whatever was the office of the Mediator, he is no where represented as *preventing* the death, consequent on *sin*, nor saving men from *deserved* punishment. The latter part of the proposition is liable to serious objections, inasmuch, as it represents God as *changeable*, if not worse. The moment we grant this proposition, all reasoning respecting the designs of God are ended. If he is not *unchangeable*, nothing can be proved, nor disproved, affirmed, nor denied, respecting him, with any degree of consistency.

I fully believe, on Scripture testimony, that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain,waiting to be delivered of this body of sin and death; and that as Christ came to save his people *from their sins*, he will completely accomplish the errand, and thereby subdue all things to himself; and we have no better authority for saying that *any description* of people are his,than we have for saying, that *all souls* are his, and were given him for the very purpose of giving to them eternal life.

The salvation of God, in this view, in no wise diminishes from the denunciation against the breakers of the moral law. Every one, without respect of persons, must suffer according to the evil of his ways. The *lex talionis* is still in force, and it is equally true that 'the wicked shall be cast into hell and all the nations that forget God,' as that 'all the ends of the world shall remember and return to the Lord.'

The fourth proposition, as stated above, though perhaps not intended,evidently grows out of the discourse—to which I say,—Amen.

Note.—*Eternal death*, is the *third death*, according to commentators, denounced upon the first pair. To be sure of enough, they tell us it was *temporal—spiritual*—and *eternal*. It was not *temporal*, or Adam died thus on the day of the lapse. It was not *eternal*, or endless misery, for the Scripture refutes the absurdity. It was then *moral death*, a departure from a life of righteousness, or moral rectitude, or as the apostle testifies, the carnal mind. A sense of wrong doing gendereth fear, and fear hath torment. And yet, blessed be God, he loves us with *great* love, even when *dead* in trespasses and sins, and we are told that these *dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God and *live*. I repeat the sentiment, that this *third death*, called the *eternal*, is not found, save in the tradition of man;for if it were, and men deserve this death, the Saviour from this death must be unjust. But blessed be his name, he is a just God and a Saviour.—AMEN.

MENTOR.—*Albany.*

CONTROVERSIAL.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—When I reflect on the multitude of Clergymen in this city, who are lolling at their ease, and receiving salaries amply sufficient to enable them to give themselves fully to the 'work of the ministry,'—I cannot refrain from expressing my astonishment and indignation at the apathy with which they appear to suffer, *in silence* (among other evils) the *mis-named* 'GOSPEL HERALD,' freely to circulate among our citizens, laden with all its pestiferous poison, without once openly and ingenuously, administering some antidote to its dangerous errors. Is it indeed to enable these *gentlemen* to live in habitations, rivalling in splendour the palaces of princes? Or is it to indulge them in tables laden with the 'pick of the season and the choicest wines,' that these—what? Dumb dogs? Pardon me—these *gentlemen*—extort enormous sums from the fortunes of the affluent,and from the hard-earned pittance of the poor? Or are their thousands *per annum* presented to them that they may be freed from all secular affairs,and thereby be fully at liberty to 'watch over our souls as those that must give account?'—Methinks every truly pious, or honest man, will readily join with me in asserting, that the latter is the *intent* of the donors.

It will avail these gentlemen little, Mr. Editor, to

affect, that your weekly lucubrations are too insignificant to merit *their* attention; or too palpably erroneous to deceive any of the *learned*. We all know that the *majority* of every Christian community is composed of those, whose daily avocations preclude the possibility of their entering into deep and abstruse theological disquisitions; and it is for the benefit of *these* that they should be instant in counteracting dangerous errors, and barefaced heresies, such as, in my opinion, are promulgated in the HERALD.

Leaving, however, those gentlemen to their own conceptions of right and wrong, and to answer to the *Bishop of souls* for their defections, permit me, Mr. Editor, a plain, unlettered man, to 'offer mine opinion' on a point considered essential among Christians—namely—Whether those that are lost are eternally so!—And I hope, Mr. Editor, that if the following thoughts shall merit publication, and an answer from any person, that it may be given dispassionately, and free from all useless aspersions on the religious belief of our fellow-Christians.

The excellency of the Gospel dispensation is greatly evidenced by those sanctions of rewards and punishments which it offers to all its hearers, in order to engage them to be obedient to its precepts. It promises eternal happiness to the upright, and denounces a punishment of everlasting misery against the finally impenitent. It is to the first a 'savour of life,' unto life, on the other a 'savour of death unto death.'

But whence is it that men are so disingenuous? The reason seems to be this: The promise of eternal happiness is so agreeable to the inclinations and wishes of mankind, that all who call themselves Christians universally and willingly subscribe to the belief of it: but then there is a something so shocking in the consideration of eternal torments, and seemingly, such an infinite disproportion between an endless duration of pain, and a short life spent in pleasure, that men can scarcely be brought to confess that eternal misery awaits the wicked in a future state.

Christ Jesus says distinctly, and that without reserve, in Matt. xxv. 46. 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment.' It is therefore a legitimate conclusion, that the torments reserved for the wicked hereafter, are eternal. The word of God himself assures us, in line upon line, that it will be so.

To quote all the texts that might be produced in proof of this, would be almost endless. Suffice it to instance only a few. In the Old Testament, in the Book of Daniel, chap. xii. 2. we are told, that 'Some shall awake to everlasting life, and others to everlasting contempt.' In the Book of Isaiah it is said, chap. lxvi. 24. 'Their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched.' And, in horror at the prospect of the continuance of the torments of the damned, the same holy prophet breaks out, 'Who can dwell with everlasting burning!'

But the New Testament is still fuller on this point, it being a revelation which brought this and such like particulars to a *clear light*—St. Jude tells us of certain despisers, &c. that 'for them was reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.'—In the Revelation it is declared, the 'that the smoke of the torments' of the wicked 'ascendeth for ever and ever.' And if we believe the witness of men inspired of God, the witness of the Son of God, who had the Holy Spirit in its fulness, is far greater.—He says, 'It is better for thee to enter into life maimed; that is, better to forego the gratification of thy lusts, or incur the displeasure of thy friend, which may be as dear to thee as a hand or a foot, 'than having two hands and feet,' (that is, for indulging the one, or disobeying God to oblige the other) 'to be cast into hell, where their worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched!*'

I know that it has been objected by you, Mr. Editor, that the words *everlasting*, and *ever and ever*, are often usedi n the Scriptures, (especially, in the Old Testament) when they signify not an endless duration, but a limited term of time.

I grant this: but I reply, that when the words are used with this limitation, they either manifestly appear to be used so from the context, or are put in opposition to occasional types, which God gave his people on some special occasions, as when it is said, 'It shall be a perpetual, or everlasting statute,' &c. that is, a standing type, and not merely transient or occasional, as was the pillar of cloud, the manna, &c. Or they may have a relation to that covenant God made with his *spiritual* Israel; which, if understood in a spiritual sense, will be *everlasting*, though the ceremonial dispensation be abolished.

But be this as it may (*for the present*)—It is positively said, 'That the righteous shall go into life eternal.' From which words, all are ready to grant, that the life promised to the righteous SHALL be eternal. And why the punishment threatened to the wicked should not be understood to be eternal likewise, when the very same words in the original are used to express the duration of each, no shadow of reason can be given.

But, Sir, there cannot be one argument urged why God *should* reward his saints with everlasting happiness, which will not equally prove that he *ought* to punish sinners with eternal misery.

For, since we know nothing how he will deal with either, but by a Divine Revelation; and since, as was proved by the foregoing argument, he has as positively threatened to punish the wicked eternally as to reward the righteous; it follows, that his truth will be as much called in question, did he not inflict his punishments, as it would be, if he did not confer his rewards.

My opinion, Mr. Editor, is, that Christ is the only Mediator between God and man, but at the hour of man's death, (if he die in his sins) Christ's mediation and intercession for him is irrecoverably gone.

Should the foregoing arguments prove acceptable to your readers, and admissible by you, it is probable that I shall enlarge on the subject, as I seriously assure you, 'the half is not told.' At the same time, I am your's respectfully,

VINEDRESSER.

ANSWER.

WE are almost constrained to *pity* the Rev. '*gentlemen*,' when we consider they are thus roughly *dressed* by one of their *own faith*; who we think would, in the end, if he were to progress in a corresponding ratio, instead of *dressing*, absolutely *pull them up by the roots!* Would Vinedresser make use of this uncivil and plain phraseology in his address to his *spiritual directors*, if he considered the *dignity* of their stations,—the *sanctity* of their characters—the *purity* of their motives—the great *zeal* they possess for the truth—and their acknowledged *superiority* over the rest of mankind? Did he take into consideration the hazard he ran of *wounding hearts* already *agonized* with suffering, and *bleeding* for poor sinners, to *save* whom, they are willing to forego all the *enjoyments* and *comforts of this life*, if they could but save *one* poor soul from the dreadful abyss which is ingulphing millions? *Ah, no,*—none of these considerations, we are persuaded, were permitted by him to have any influence over his mind, or he never would have expressed himself in terms which can only be justified on the *strange* supposition that they are *true!* We are constrained, however, in conformity with the opinion of Vinedresser, who says, 'Methinks every *truly pious, or honest man*, will readily join with me in asserting that the latter is the intent of the *donors*,' to say—we think so too.

Vinedresser concludes his *second* paragraph, by declaring as his opinion, that '*barefaced* heresies are promulgated in the Herald.' In answer to this, we observe, that it has been with regret that we have witnessed this in the teaching of some of our correspondents; and that we have, and shall continue to counteract, by publishing the truth, 'the dangerous errors,' and *heresies* we allude to.

Vinedresser in his *third* paragraph, interrogates,—'Whether those that are *lost*, are *eternally so?*' To this, we answer—there are various opinions. The Calvinists and Arminians say they *are*—but the *Scriptures* say, (and we believe them) "that Christ came to *seek* and to *save* that which was *lost;* and that he *finished* the work he came to do'—and the Scripture slikewise say, that 'All nations whom God hath made shall come and worship before him,'—and Christ said, 'Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out'—and the Scriptures farther say, 'All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him'—therefore, we believe, those that are *lost*, are *not* eternally so; for if this were the case, Christ did not *find*, nor *save* them, neither could it ever be true that *all* should come and worship, if a *part* never came!

Vinedresser's *fourth* paragraph would do much better, if the word *law* was substituted in the place of *gospel*. We think, if he can produce no other *evidence* of the *excellence* of the *gospel* dispensation than the *rewards* it promises to the *righteous*, and the *punishments* it threatens the *wicked*, he would make a poor advocate. Indeed, on this ground, we think he would never be able to convince any man that the *endless* misery, according to him, threatened under the *gospel*, was more *excellent* than the *temporal* suffering threatened under the *law*, if the man was going to suffer it! In few words; we believe Vinedresser has mistaken the *law* for the *gospel!* The law was made up of conditions—the gospel is *good news* that all is *given, without money or price!* We shall expect Vinedresser to bring something else besides his *own* assertion, to prove, that the gospel 'promises *eternal happiness* to the *upright;* and denounces a punishment of *everlasting misery* against the *finally impenitent*." We should be gratified if he would inform us what chapter and verse contains this declaration. And farther, how many *finally impenitent* sinners there will be, when '*every tongue* swears to the Lord, and says, In the Lord *have I righteousness and strength?*'

Vinedresser's *fifth* paragraph wants a little proof. He asks, 'But whence is it that men are so *disengenuous?*' And answers—'The reason seems to be this: The *promise* of eternal happiness is so *agreeable* to the inclinations and wishes of mankind, that all who call themselves Christians *universally* and willingly subscribe to the belief of it; but then there is a something so *shocking* in the *consideration of eternal* torments, and seemingly such an *infinite disproportion* between an *endless* duration of pain, and a *short life* spent in pleasure, that men can scarcely be brought to confess, that eternal misery awaits the wicked in a *future state*.' Let us examine this. Mankind are *disingenuous* because God has promised eternal happiness---and men like it, because they think there is *seemingly* an *infinite* disproportion between a *short* life, &c., and *endless* misery. Now we think there is a *real* difference; not a *seeming* one. It is our opinion, that facts will not justify Vinedresser in his assertions. All Christians (Christian Universalists excepted) 'willingly subscribe' to the doctrine of *eternal happiness*, provided it is for *themselves;* and say nothing about the '*seeming disproportion*', and are quite willing that endless misery should await their wicked neighbours. We say quite willing, for many of them are outrageous, if you do not join with them and damn the wicked for ever! If *endless* misery is so very *shocking* to mankind, how *shocking* must it be to that God whose *name and nature is Love?* 'Love,' saith the Scriptures, '*thinketh no ill.*' And the Scriptures, likewise, declare, that God loved the world! That God is unchangeable; consequently, will love them for ever, without end! Will he make those whom he *loves endlessly miserable?* Will he suffer those he loves to endure that, the mere idea of which is *shocking?* We think not. The apostle declared—'I am persuaded, that neither life, nor death, nor things present, nor things to come, &c., shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.' Again—We inform Vinedresser, that 'the way of transgressors is hard.' If endless torments await those that spend a short life in pleasure, it will await very few of the wicked. For 'tribulation and anguish shall be upon every soul of man that doeth evil.' Is this pleasure? We think not.

Vinedresser's *sixth* paragraph reads thus, 'Christ Jesus says distinctly, and that without reserve, in Matt. xxv. 46. 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment.' It is therefore a legitimate conclusion, that the torments reserved for the wicked hereafter are eternal. The word of God himself assures us, in line upon line, that it will be so.' Now we say, that Christ did not say, 'these shall go away into *everlasting punish-*

ment—therefore, it is *not* a legitimate conclusion, that the torments reserved for the wicked hereafter are *eternal*. *Neither* does the 'word of God himself assure us, in line upon line, that it will be so.' We shall prove this! Previous to doing this, however, we would suggest to Vinedresser the expediency of altering his creed a little; for if eternal (never ending) torments are reserved for the *wicked* in a future state, we think on his ground, *Universal damnation*, and not *salvation*, would be the case. The Scriptures are explicit—'The soul that sinneth it shall die—death hath passed upon all men, for that *all* have sinned—cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them—he that offendeth in *one* point is guilty of *all*—in many things we offend all—God looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did good, *and there was none good, no! not* ONE!' The condition of the law was *perfect obedience*. Except the man Christ Jesus, no man ever kept the law—hence the Scriptures declare, 'They are all gone out of the way, there is none that understandeth. *There is none righteous, no, not one!* Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that *every mouth may be stopped*, and all the world may become guilty before God.' Now bring forward *your eternal torments*, and where are you? Will you pretend to say, that if the wicked *repents*, and *cries*, and *mourns*, that his *tears* will *atone* for his *sins*? If so, we tell you in the impressive language of Scripture, 'without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.' And that 'Christ made peace by the blood of his cross,'—not by the *tears*, or *repentance* of wicked men! We, therefore, think that your *conclusion*, so far from being a *legitimate* one, is very clearly *illegitimate!*

(To be continued.)

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR,—The belief that there are many things hid from the wise and prudent, which are revealed unto babes, encourages me also to cast in my mite among those, who out of their abundance have intreasured their communications in your useful paper. In your remarks on Matthew xxvi. 24. exhibited in the 22d and 23d Numbers of the Gospel Herald, you have, I think, abundantly proved by the declaration of him who cannot lie, that the salvation of Judas is secured; and that Christ when he said, 'It had been good for that man if he had not been born,' *did not* thereby aver, that it had been good for Judas if he had not been *created*, or made to exist. I will now explain, if God will please to vouchsafe me ability, what I conceive to be the *meaning* of those words. If the reader will turn to the third chapter of John's Gospel, he will there find that Christ said to Nicodemus, 'Except a man be born again, he cannot *see* the kingdom of God.' Again, John, in his first Epistle, 4th chap. and 7th verse, declares, that 'every one that loveth is born of God'—and in the 5th chap. 1st verse, he says, that 'whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.'—No one, I presume, will dispute the fact that he who is born of God, is born again, and he who is born again, is born of God, and that he who is born of God, is *influenced* by the Spirit of God. Now when Judas betrayed his Lord and Master, was he not *influenced* by Satan? And if he, who is *influenced* by the Spirit of God, to believe on him, can be said to be born of God,' may not Judas, who was *influenced* by an evil spirit to betray his Lord, be said to be born of Satan? By looking at the 8th chap. of John, 44th verse, the reader will find that Christ told the Jews, 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.' Now, how could the devil with propriety be called their father, unless they were at that time his offspring? and how could they be his offspring, and *of him*, unless they were born *of him*, or *influenced* by him to commit sin? If he whose spirit is *enlightened* and *influenced* by God, can be said to be born of God; then he whose spirit is *darkened* and *influenced* by the devil, can be said to be born of the devil. We think then that it may be said of Judas, with propriety, agreeable to the language of Scripture, that from the moment that Satan entered into him till he repented, he was born of Satan. Our Saviour, speaking of Judas, says, 'It had been good for that man if he had not been born'—How born? From a state of nonentity into being? No! A just God would never have given life to a mortal whom he *foreknew* would become a loser by existence,—How born, then? Born of whom? Ans. Of Satan. It had been good for him, then, if he had not been born of Satan, or *influenced* by Satan to *betray* his Lord; and it had been good for *Peter*, likewise, if he had not been born of Satan, or *influenced* by Satan to *deny* his Lord. Is there any thing unnatural or forced, in the preceding remarks? I think not. Our Saviour said to Nicodemus, 'Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye *must* be born again.' Who would now expect that our Lord meant to infer from that declaration, that he who *believed* on him was born again, or as St. John defines it, born of God, unless the apostle had *thus explained* it? And after perceiving by this, that he who is *influenced* by God to love and believe on him, is born of God, is it not plainly to be discovered, that he who is *influenced* by Satan to do wickedly, is, while under that influence, born of Satan; and that it would be good for us all, for our present peace, if we were not born of our father the devil, or influenced by him to commit sin, the wages of which is death? You have thus, Mr. Editor, my thoughts on those words, which our Saviour spake concerning Judas. If you think them worthy a place in your paper, you are welcome to insert them. That God may make you wise as a serpent, and harmless as a dove, and enable you to become a powerful instrument to aid in the overthrow of Antichrist, is the sincere prayer of the weakest of all your brethren in the Gospel of Universal love.

S*****.

MOLOCH.

A DISCIPLE of Calvin, and a preacher of his heresy, in a conversation we recently had with him, declared, "There will be *no natural affection in heaven;—I shall then be like God;—and if* ONE OF MY CHILDREN *is then suffering the torments* of HELL-FIRE *interminably, I shall behold him unmoved, for I shall be swallowed up in* LOVE!!!" If this is *heaven*—give me *hell!!!* If this is *love*—give me *hatred!!!* That *sympathetic feeling* implanted in our bosoms by the God of Love—that *natural affection* which the God of Nature, the Saviour of the world, expressed, when dying on the cross, he said, '*Father, forgive them*, for they know not what they do,' is by this accursed heresy, *banished* heaven, and *consigned to hell!!!*

Reader, there is only TRUTH and ERROR! Look at their *origin*—

Reason to man by God was given,
That man might learn the way to heaven.
Hell made an effort—hence the schism,
Self-contradicting Calvinism!!!

Reason from heaven is light Divine,
Illuming our benighted mind;
But Calvinism from hell was sent,
Our purse and heads to circumvent!

Methodism, alias Antichrist.

IN 'Tract, Number 2, published by the New-York Methodist Tract Society, September, 1818.' Entitled '*On the Necessity and Nature of true repentance*,' we read as follows—'What! Shalt thou be eternally happy in heaven? Is this glory offered then a *free gift*? Yes, *surely* as thou art a descendant of Adam—*surely* as thou art born to die, this glory is offered to the sinner, TO OBTAIN WHICH, thou *must assuredly repent*, or be LOST *for ever!!!*' Repentance, among other things, is described to consist in 'earnest attendance on the preaching of the gospel, and meetings for prayer and social worship,' &c. Quere. Would a Methodist reason this way, if *his money* depended on the fair construction of the words he used? We think not. Can any thing be given, which is never received? No! In page 3d we read—'A fourth proof of the importance of repentance is manifest from the *grand design of God in thy creation*, preservation, and redemption: the design of these was thy *happiness* in glorifying God and *enjoying him for ever*—and this never can be without repentance. This *noble design* will be *defeated*, and thy soul and body, be for ever miserable in hell, except *thou* repentest!' If this is not the doctrine of Antichrist, there is no such thing as the doctrine of Antichrist. What! The *design* of God *fail* of its accomplishment for want of the *assistance* of *man!* Shame on such impious conclusions. If these perverters of the Scriptures were to examine their Bibles, they would find, that repentance itself is *given*---it is as much a *gift* as the *air* we breathe, or the *rain* that falls! See Acts ii. 31. 'Him hath God exalted with his right hand a Prince and a Saviour, for to *give repentance* to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.' See 2 Tim. ii. 25.

In page 4, we read the following---'O fly at once to the open arms of a Saviour's love and mercy: there is no escape but there: no shelter from the fiery deluge, but Jesus Christ, the sinner's friend, a friend *now*, but *not* a sinner's *friend* in the great day of judgment.' We pronounce this *blasphemy!* Nay more---We challenge the *whole Methodist connexion* to produce *one* testimony from Scripture, to prove that Christ is a *changeable* being, and will in *future* be an *enemy* to *sinners!* Let them answer to their conscience, their Saviour, and Judge, for this unprovoked and damnable slander, uttered against the Saviour of the world. Reader, hear the declaration of this calumniated Saviour---'If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not; for I came, not to judge the world, but to save the world---the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day, &c., the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is *life* everlasting.' John xii. The Scriptures declare, that '*God is Love*.' And the God of love, speaking by his prophet, said, 'I am God, I change not!' Compare this with the *tract* from which we made the above extracts, and if the 'Lord be God, follow him;' but if Antichrist be God, follow him!

Should these remarks meet the eye of any Methodist, who conscientiously believes the Scriptures to be a revelation from God, and who believes they are entitled to greater credit than the declaration of fallible man, to such an one we say, 'Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they (not Adam Clarke, nor the tracts of your connexion) are they which testify of Christ!'

It is manifest, that the word repentance is but little understood. It is a *consequence*, not *cause* of salvation. A man *repents* whenever he changes his mind; let the subject or concern be what it may. It is *turning*. Paul addressing the Ephesians, says, 'In whom ye also *trusted* after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation.' They were saved---they were informed of this fact, of which they had been ignorant---and when they believed this truth, they repented, or turned from the worship of dumb idols, to the worship of the true God. Paul does not say, that *after* they repented they were saved---the *cause* was their salvation, the knowledge of which produced in them a *turning* to God their Saviour! And the time is coming, when 'All the ends of the world shall remember and *turn* (repent) unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him. For the earth is the Lord's, and he is the Governor among the nations.' Then, this Methodist heresy will be annihilated, and death and hell destroyed! 'Looking for this blessed hope,' we say, 'Come Lord Jesus, come quickly!'

To Correspondents.

J. C. Is received, *attempting* to prove *salvation conditional*, by complying with our *sine qua non;* and it is with regret, we add, that the number of communications on hand must defer its publication for the present.

'An Attentive Reader of the Gospel Herald,' requesting an exposition of Rev. xxii. 11. is received. We shall comply with his request, as soon as we have room in our columns, &c.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1820. NO. 35.

Controversial.

ANSWER TO VINEDRESSER.

[CONCLUDED.]

Parable of the Sheep and Goats.

We shall prove, that Matt. xxv. does not treat of any thing but what relates, as respects mankind, to their natural lives. Nay, more, a *future state of rewards and punishments*, is not even *hinted at!* This done, and we think the subject will be purged of the errors, with which an unbelieving world have clothed it. *First*, it is not a *day of judgment*, but *Christ coming in his kingdom*, which is spoken of. *Second*, The time when this should take place, was *confined* to the *generation* who lived *previous* to the crucifixion of Christ. *Third*, the *eternal life* spoken of is the gospel church state, into which the *first fruits*—the *elect*—or *believers* in this world, are received. And, the *everlasting punishment*, is the *darkness of mind* consequent upon a *state* of *unbelief*.

We notice, first, in order, the declaration of Christ to Peter, Matt. xvi. 19. 'And I will give unto thee the *keys of the kingdom of heaven*,' &c. Peter unquestionably supposed that Christ was going to establish a temporal sovereignty, and reign king over Jerusalem. And from the promise of Christ, to give him the *keys of the kingdom*, he expected to have confided to his care the *fiscal* concerns of the kingdom, &c. When Christ, as related in the 21st verse, communicated to his disciples, how he should suffer and die at Jerusalem, Peter, trembling for his *office*, as related in the 22d verse, 'began to rebuke him (Christ) saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee; verse 23. But he (Christ) turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.' The *keys* of this kingdom were not delivered unto Peter, until after the resurrection and ascension of Christ; and Peter received these keys in a vision from heaven, a great sheet, knit at the four corners, &c., while he was on the house of Simon the tanner. See Acts x. Christ, see Matt. xvi. 24, 25, 26. explains more fully the nature of his kingdom to his disciples, and gives them to understand, that the salvation of their souls depended upon its *spirituality*. He then, declares, see 27th, 28th verses. 'For the Son of man shall come in the *glory of his Father*, with his *angels*; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be *some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.*' Reader, if you believe Christ told the truth, and believe that truth, you will have no difficulty with the xxv. of Matt. But, to proceed, You will please to notice, that Christ said, when he came in his kingdom, he would reward every man according to his works. By recurring to the xxiii. 29th to 39th verse, you will find, that Christ enumerates the *works* of those to whom he addresses himself—and at the 36th verse, says, 'Verily, I say unto you, *All these things shall come upon this generation.*' Quere. Were not they rewarded according to their works? We think any other evidence is unnecessary to prove the chapter under consideration to be figurative, and a *parable*, than the declaration, 'Without a parable spake he not unto them.' If it is to be taken literally, *sheep* and *goats*, and not *men*, are interested. And if a parable, it is all figurative, &c. In the xxiv. 3d verse. The disciples of Christ privately asked him *two* questions. *First*, 'When shall these things be?' *Second*, 'And what the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the (*age* translated) *world*? Christ proceeds, and informs his disciples, first, of the signs which should *precede* his coming, &c., to the 30th verse; and in the 30th verse, declares, 'Then,' when? Ans. When these things had happened, which he said should precede his coming! '*Then* shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and *then* shall all the tribes of the earth (the Jews) mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels,' &c. see 33d and 34th verses. 'So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near at the doors. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.' Christ then, to the end of the xxiv. chap. informs his disciples of the state of things at his coming; and tells them to *watch;* and declares he shall come in a day that the evil servant looketh not for, &c. Christ commences the xxv. chap. by saying, 'Then shall the *kingdom of heaven* be likened unto ten virgins,' &c. We ask, when? Ans. When Christ comes in his kingdom, &c. At the 13th verse, he again tells his disciples to watch, 'For ye know not the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.' Christ then commences another parable, at the 14th verse, and likens the kingdom of heaven to a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants and delivered unto them his goods.' We consider *Christ* the *man*—his *servants* the *Jews*—the *goods* committed to the servants, the *gospel* (or news) *of the kingdom*—the *travelling* into a far country, the *crucifixion* of Christ. See 15th verse. 'And unto *one* he gave *five* talents, to another *two*, and to another *one*, &c., and straightway took his journey.' You will please to notice, that he gave according to the *ability* of the *receiver;* not according to the *munificence* of the *giver!* To his *disciples* he gave *seven* talents—to the other Jews *one*. By recurring again to the xxiv. chap. and at the 45th to 51st verses, you will find Christ exhorting his disciples to be faithful and wise servants, and they should be rulers over his household; (his church, in his spiritual kingdom, when he should come, &c.,) and that evil servant, who (had the one talent, and) said my Lord delayeth his coming (which the Jews said, and still say) shall be cast out where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. The 30th verse of this chap. again repeats the declaration, 'and cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness (the *one* talent is taken away) there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.' Then commences this *celebrated parable*, at the 31st verse. We now ask the reader, *Had* Christ come in his kingdom with his angels in power and great glory, when he spake this parable which is contained from the 31st to 46th verses, of this xxv. chap. inclusive? There is no man in his senses, will answer this question in the *affirmative!* Then we answer, in the words of the passage itself,' When the Son of man shall come in his glory,' &c., then shall take place, that which is recorded in the xxv. chap. of Matt. from the 31st verse to the end of the chapter. On this question we stand strong---we have the testimony of Christ himself, in answer to his disciples, see xxiv. 3 'Tell us, when shall these things be? And what the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the AGE!'—— Namely——'Verily, I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till *all* these things be *fulfilled;* verse 34. For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be *some standing here*, which shall *not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.*' Reader, we appeal to your conscience---Can this be *truth*, if the coming of the Son of man is still *future*? Do you believe he came, *after* making the declarations in Matt. xvi. 27, 28. and xxiv. 30, 31, 34, 35. and previous to making the declaration in the 31st verse, in xxv? No! You cannot believe so! Then you *must* believe, that *when* he came, that which is recorded in 31st to 46th verses inclusive, *took place!* 'If you deny this, you give Jesus Christ, your God and Saviour, *the lie direct!* For he declared, that the 'generation' to whom he addressed himself should not pass, till *all these things be fulfilled!* 'If Baal be God serve him---but if the Lord be God serve him!!!' Does this view of the subject disagree with your *preconceived* opinions? Be it so---Does it *disagree* with the words, nay, with the positive declaration of your God and Judge? 'To the law and the testimony---If you speak not according to the things *written in the book*, it is because there is no light in you.' Mark the phraseology,---32d verse. 'And before him shall be gathered all *nations;* and he shall separate them (How?) ONE from another!' Is not the *nation* of the Jews *separated* and distinct from all nations? When did this separation take place? Ans. *After* the destruction of Jerusalem; and they *were* cast out into outer darkness! See Acts ii. 16th to 23d verse. Peter says, 'It shall come to pass in the last days,' &c. And declares, 'This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel.' See 20th verse. 'The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord.' Compare this with Matt. xxiv. 29. Immediately after this, &c., shall the Son of man come, &c. What was the tribulation of those days? Ans. The siege and destruction of Jerusalem! Immediately after this, shall the sun be darkened, &c.,---'And then, shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven,' &c. Now examine the parable. One nation is separated from another---Jew and Gentile constitute the human race. One is put on the *right* hand, the other on the *left*.

We cheerfully embrace this opportunity to confess our own errors. We considered these *sheep* and *goats*, as *man*, and the fallen angelic spirits. We have been forced by conviction of the truth, to acknowledge, that this view of the subject is *wrong!* An examination of the text, and context, has produced this conviction, and we now stand on a foundation which cannot easily be shaken!

The 34th verse reads, 'Inherit the kingdom prepared for you *from* the foundation of the world.' We consider this the gospel kingdom, in which Christ has come, or the *αιωνιον* life; and different from the life mentioned by Paul, Ephes. i. 4. 'According as he hath chosen us in him *before* the *foundation* of the world.' In Col. i. 13. We consider Paul, as referring to the kingdom of the gospel in this life. 'Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son.' Now the Jews were deprived of their *one* talent, and cast into outer darkness, &c. This kingdom is likewise described, to be 'Righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.' This is effected by the Comforter, or Holy Ghost, who testifies of Christ, that he is our righteousness, &c. 'God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,' &c. Christ is the Mediator---- this kingdom of the gospel, or Mediatorial kingdom, will continue until all things are subdued unto himself; and then this kingdom will cease,---and the kingdom be resumed which was *before* the foundation of the world. See 1 Cor. xv. 22d to 28th verses. Paul likewise, says, 'Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.' When God shall be all in all, this life will be in all; and all will have life, &c. agreeably to Christ's declaration---'As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and because I live (in the present tense) ye shall (in the future tense) live also.' The righteous, as described, 37th verse, disclaim all righteousness, in their own persons, and justly too, for they have none. The true believer in Christ considers all men as brethren---the

Jews, considered the Gentiles as dogs. They not having been kind to them, were not regarded as doing any thing for Christ, who received the Gentiles in the character of brethren. The words 'depart ye *cursed*,' are synonymous with depart ye *rejected*. All, therefore, are *cursed* by the *law;* because the law requiring perfect obedience, and all being guilty, the law *rejects all!* Do this and live! The soul that sinneth it shall die! 'And these shall go away into *everlasting* punishment; but the righteous into life *eternal*.' 46th verse. Is the word translated *eternal* and *everlasting* in this 46th verse, (it is one, and the same word) to be considered as absolutely meaning an *endless duration, for ever*, in the now common understanding of the term? Be it so. But if you will examine the *original*, and admit Christ as a witness, you will have to alter your mind! If this word (αιωνιον,) translated eternal, and everlasting, necessarily means an unlimited duration, what will you do with the question of Christ's disciples, and his answer, see Matt. xxiv. 3. 'What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the END of the (αιωνος translated) *world?* Did not the disciples of Christ know the meaning of the words they used? If they did, the translation is *wrong* in both chapters! If not---they asked, When shall be the END of FOR EVER! EVERLASTING! And wonderful to relate, Christ immediately replies---'Take heed that no man deceive you'---and adds, see 34th verse, 'Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled!' What! *For ever* and *everlasting* come to an *end* in ONE *generation !!!* Would Christ have suffered his disciples to have remained in error, and immediately have added, 'Take heed that no man deceive you?' We think not. The fact is, this word is something more than equivocal in its meaning, according to the use made of it by the translators of the Scriptures. In Col. i. 26. we read, '*Even* the mystery which hath been hid from *ages*, and from generations, but is now made manifest to his saints.' We here find the word αιωνων, translated *ages*. If this word means *for ever*, how would it read here--The mystery which hath been hid from *for ever*, and *everlasting* is now made manifest'---it is hid no longer---for ever has come to an *end!* In Matt. xiii. 40. we read---'As therefore the tares are gathered, and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the *end* of this *world*.' The word translated *world*, is αιωνος. Here is *everlasting* come to an *end* again! In the 38th verse, the translation is correct. It is κοσμος which is translated *world*. Our translators not being willing that their wicked neighbours should be saved, and having predicated their *everlasting* misery on the word αιωνος, they were under the necessity of twisting and pulling very often to preserve their consistency, and make their story straight. It seems *everlasting* could be *shortened*, or *lengthened*, just as suited their conveniency. In Matt. xii. 32. this word is rendered 'neither in this *world*, neither in the *world to come*.' Or, neither in this *for ever*, nor in the *for ever* to come! If this word means *everlasting* and *eternal*, translate it everlasting and eternal uniformly. It means as much in one place, as it does in another. This, however, would not answer. If this was done, your Bible would be unintelligible; and strictly speaking, it never will be intelligible until the word is uniformly rendered *age*, or *ages*, singular, or plural, as the case may be.

We consider the evidence we have adduced to prove that the *everlasting* and *eternal*, (as it is rendered) in Matt. xxv. 46. will come to an *end*, is *incontestable!* We now refer the reader to 2 Thes. i. 6th to 9th verses inclusive. We presume to say, that the same subject is there treated of. We consider the unbelieving Jews referred to by Paul, as those who troubled them. The *time*, and *manner* of Christ's being revealed, the same as related in Matt. The Jews did not *know* God. God, speaking of them, says, 'My people do not know,' &c. Neither did they believe, or *obey* the gospel of Jesus Christ. They 'shall be punished with αιωνιον destruction (Paul says!) from the presence of the Lord, and from the *glory* of his *power*.' Compare this, with Matt. xxiii. 37, 38, 39. The 38th and 39th verses read thus---'Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, *Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord*.' When the Jews come to the knowledge that Christ is the Saviour, the Messiah, whom they so anxiously expect, they will then experience the glory of his power, which is *salvation!* And when their eyes are enlightened that they may see him, and be in his presence, they will exclaim in the language of the Psalmist xvi. 11. 'In thy presence *is* fulness of joy; at thy *right hand there are* pleasures for evermore!' But, being banished from his *presence*, and placed at 'his *left hand*,' they 'bow down their back alway! I say then, have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid! But through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, &c. Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness. For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief; even so have these also now *not believed*, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy. For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might (damn them for ever! No!) have mercy *upon all!* O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable his *judgments* (true, brother Paul—not a Calvinist, nor an Arminian ever found them out; or understood them in the *least!*) and his ways past finding out. For who hath known the mind of the Lord? (John Calvin thought he did.) Or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, (all who hold to *conditional* salvation, if they could be *believed!*) and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For *of* him, (then it is not *of* man,) and *through him*, (then it is not *through* man) and *to* him *are* all things; (then there is none, *of*—or *through*—or *to* the devil!) *to whom be glory for ever. AMEN!*"

Of the 41st verse, of this xxv. Matt. we remark, the language is highly figurative. And although *fire* is mentioned, it is still *darkness* into which they are sent. See 2 Peter ii. 4. 'For if God spared not the angels that sinned; but cast *them* down to hell, and delivered *them* into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment,' &c. Therefore, it could not mean these *angels*, in Matt. xxv. 41. who are to be sent into the place *prepared* for the devil and his angels, for they were there *already!* And the place, or state, was originally prepared for them, *not* for those who are there described as being on the left hand, and prefigured by *goats*. And the context to the passage quoted from Peter, corresponds with that quoted from Paul's Epistle to Thes. and evidently means the Jews.

The word translated *hell* in 2 Peter ii. 4. is ταρταρωσας, *sed catenis* caliginis, *vinctos in Tartarum, detrusit; also chained in darkness, bound in hell, forced or thrust down*. In fine—to be in *gehenna*. To be in darkness and uncertainty. See Number 29, answer to Amator Veritatis.

Vinedresser, in his *seventh* paragraph, remarks—'To quote all the texts that might be produced in proof of this, would be almost endless. Suffice it to instance only a few. In the Old Testament, in the book of Daniel, xii. 2. we are told, that 'Some shall awake to everlasting life, and others to everlasting shame and contempt.' In the book of Isaiah it is said, lxvi. 24. 'Their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched.' And in horror at the prospect of the continuance of the torments of the damned, the same holy prophet breaks out, 'Who can dwell with everlasting burning?' If Vinedresser will take his Bible, and turn to chap. x. of Daniel's prophecy, he will find the commencement of the subject which he has handed in a mutilated condition, &c. In the 14th verse, the angel, or messenger, instructs Daniel, and says, 'Now I am come to make thee understand *what shall befall thy people in the latter days;* for yet the vision *is* for *many* days.' (Not *for*, or *to* eternity!) The facts stated to Daniel in chap. xi. and which apparently have no immediate connexion with the Israelites, are incontestable evidence of the truth of the prophecy. Daniel is here informed of the overthrow of Persia by Alexander; and the division of his kingdom at his death, to his four successors, and not to his posterity, &c. Daniel is likewise informed of the fate of Alexander's *successors*, &c. The *time* when some shall awake to *everlasting life*, and some to *shame and everlasting contempt*, is specified at the commencement of chap. xii being simultaneous with the conclusion of the great events, mentioned in the preceding chapter. Daniel declares, 'there shall be a time of *trouble*, such as *never* was since there was a nation, to *that time*.' Christ (see Matt. xxiv. 15, 21.) quotes the words of Daniel. He declares 'Then shall be great tribulation, such as *was not* since the beginning of the world to *this time*, no, *nor ever shall be*—When ye therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place,' &c. This was the standard of the Roman army, which besieged Jerusalem. See Daniel xii. 7. Matt. xxiv. 34. 'Verily, I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.' The *sleeping* spoken of by Daniel, xii. 2. is likewise mentioned by Christ, Matt. xxv. 5. Christ says, 'they *all slumbered and slept*.' We ask Vinedresser, How this *tribulation*, which should be *greater* than ever was *before*, or should *ever* be again, and which should come upon the *generation* to whom Christ spake, and to whom he applied the prophecy of Daniel, can possibly be *future* from the *present* time, and the words of Christ, and Daniel be *true?* The time is *past!* The *slumber* is over! The sleepers have awakened! It was the *sleep* of *ignorance* in which all mankind were *steeped*, when Christ came in the *glory* of his *gospel* kingdom! Then, the Jews awoke to *shame* and *contempt*—they were cast out; and became a *by-word*—the believers in Christ awoke to everlasting life, in the knowledge of their God and Saviour Jesus Christ. And it is manifest, that *their worm* has not *died*—their *shame* and *contempt* continues; the fire of *gehenna* still *burns*—and their *worm*, or the uncertainty and torment, the consequence of their unbelief, still *gnaws*, and devours their peace. Their infidelity, and denial of their Saviour, constitutes their misery—and their *carcasses*, (for they are scattered among all nations) are an *abhorring to all flesh!* If it is objected, that the *worm* spoken of, is the *soul* of man, and that it *never* dies, we answer—'The soul that *sinneth* it shall *die!*' Are these *sinners*, whom you consign to burning and to fire? If so, remember, the *worm* spoken of is *not* the sinner's *soul*, for the Scriptures are express on this head! The soul *dies*—the worm *lives!* Please to read Leviticus xxvi. 16, 30, 38. Deut. xxviii. 22. xxxii. 21 to 30. Isaiah iii. 24. We think the passages we have referred to, if examined, will make the subject appear in its proper light. The conclusion of the quotation from Vinedresser's *seventh* paragraph, "Who *can* dwell with everlasting burning," is a perversion of Isaiah, xxxiii. 14. It is not asked who *can?* but, "Who among us *shall?*" &c. Please to look at the connexion. See 11 verse. "Ye shall conceive chaff, ye shall bring forth stubble: your *breath as* FIRE shall devour you." Is a man's *breath* everlasting (never-ending) *fire?* We think not!

Vinedresser in his eighth paragraph, says, 'But the New Testament is still fuller on this point, &c. St. Jude tells us of certain despisers, &c., that 'for them was reserved the blackness of darkness for ever'—In the Rev. it is declared, that 'the smoke of the torments' of the wicked 'ascendeth for ever and ever.' Those whom Jude speaks of, are Jews. They are reserved in darkness (unbelief) not *for ever*—but to αιωνα. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, speaking of the same people, said, 'God hath concluded them all in unbelief, [darkness,] that he might have mercy upon all.' We have already produced *irrefutable* testimony, relative to the meaning of this word translated *everlasting*, and *for ever*; and we shall produce one evidence more! And it is from a source which we hope will ensure a respectful attention—Reader, it is from your God! See Isaiah vi. 9 to 12. Here is the *state* Jude speaks of designated, and the *same* people pointed out, &c; and the question is asked, 'Lord, *how long?* And it is *limited!* We consider this to be final. Vinedresser in his *eighth* paragraph, likewise introduces the declaration of Christ, see Mark ix. 43 to 48. We refer him to Number 29, p. 118. 3 col. last paragraph, where he will find a sufficient, though brief exposition, &c. We, however, again request him to notice, that the *worm* spoken of is not the *soul*, for 'the *soul* that sinneth it *shall* die!' And we would suggest to him, that this is spoken imperatively, not as what *may* happen, but *must* take place. Any thing that Dr. Clarke says to the contrary notwithstand-

ing. The passage pretended to be quoted from Rev. xiv. 11. is a *perversion* of the text. It reads thus—'And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up *for ever* and *ever*; and they have no rest *day* nor *night*, [who?] who *worship* the *beast* and his image." If *one* for ever, means as long as eternity continues, pray how long will *two* for ever's be? Will they worship the beast in another world? Will there be *day* and *night* in another world? If the translation here, had been the same as in Col. i. 26. where the word translated *age*, is the same as is here translated *for ever*, we think Vinedresser would not have brought this as an objection. Where there is *smoke*, there is *fire*—and in the figurative language of the Apocalypse, the *smoke* of their *torment*, is the *evidence* of the misery of the worshippers of *idols*. It is not necessary to go out of New-York, to prove this! Those who worship a god, who *cannot*, or a god, who *will not save*, have no *rest*, *day* nor *night*, and the *smoke* (or evidence) of *their* torment ascendeth up from *age* to *age!* And they are literally punished for this abominable idolatry, in the very *presence* of the *Lamb*; whom they represent as a *wolf*, or a *tiger!* *These* are the *despisers*; and *they wonder and perish!!!*

Vinedresser admits in his *ninth* paragraph, that for ever, sometimes does not *mean* for ever! He, however, would have it understood, that in these cases, the *context* limits the word, &c. (Quere. How does this apply to Rev. xiv. 11?) 'But,' he adds, 'be this as it will (for the present,) *it is positively* said, 'That the righteous shall go into life eternal.' From which words, all are ready to grant, that the life promised to the righteous *shall* be eternal. And why the punishment threatened to the wicked should not be understood to be eternal likewise, when the very same words in the original are used to express the duration of each, no shadow of reason can be given.' Now we frankly confess, that whenever this is the case, *no shadow* of reason *can* be given! Nay, more—we pronounce that man, let him be whom he will, *unreasonable*, who will not say, amen to this self evident principle. We have *proved*—and proved too, beyond the *possibility* of refutation, that the *time* spoken of in Matt. xxv. 46. was the generation then living. The *life* there spoken of, is the *faith*, *hope*, and *charity*, of the *gospel* kingdom of Christ. And, heaven be praised, this will *end*, and we shall have something better. *Faith* shall be swallowed up in *certainty*, and *hope*, in full *fruition*. See 1 Cor. xiii. 8 to 13. 'For we know in *part*, and we prophecy in *part*; but, when that which is *perfect*, is come, *then* that which is in *part* shall be done *away*.' Again, see Romans, viii. 23. 'And not only *they*, but ourselves also, which have the *first fruits* of the *Spirit*, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the *redemption* of our body.' The αιωνιον life, is the knowledge of God and Christ, which believers have in this life; but, says John, (1 Epis. iii. 2.) 'Beloved, *now* are we the sons of God, (we know this much—) and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know (we have not a sickly hope—*almost* believe so to-day, and to-morrow almost have no hope, or belief at all! No! We know!) that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.' Again---Colossians chap. iii. 3, 4. 'For ye are dead; and your life is hid with Christ in God. When *Christ our life* shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory!' We now appeal to the conscience of Vinedresser—Is not this *triumphant testimony*? 'Christ is the Mighty Counsellor—the Everlasting Father—the Prince of Peace!' (not of war!) *He* is *our* life—not the word αιωνιον!!! 'Words are but wind!'—The eternal God is the rock we build on!—and our foundation is sure! Produce, if you can, evidence like this, to prove the *continuance* of the *misery* of ONE of the race of Adam! Heaven be praised, you are *foiled* at your own weapons, and your own salvation will be the price of your defeat! Our laurels are obtained without the cypress, and *defeat*, to our opponents, is to them far more glorious than victory! 'God has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth'---and the time is coming, saith the Holy Spirit, when 'thy *dead shall live*; my dead body shall they arise'---and triumphantly exclaims, 'Awake, and sing, ye that dwell in dust!' Christ 'shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied;' and 'all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him.'

Vinedresser's *tenth* paragraph, reads thus—'But, Sir, there cannot be *one* argument urged, why God *should* reward his saints with everlasting happiness, which will not equally prove that he *ought* to punish sinners with eternal misery. For since we know nothing how he will deal with either, but by a Divine Revelation; and since, as was proved by the foregoing argument, he has as positively threatened to punish the wicked eternally, as to reward the righteous; it follows, that his truth will be as much called in question, did he not inflict his punishments, as it would be, if he did not confer his rewards.' The Scriptures declare, 'By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight.' Now, where are your righteous men, whom you are going to *reward*? What have they done to deserve this, and lay God under the obligation you speak of? Tell if you can! We declare, that 'Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, &c., even the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ (not of man) *unto* all, (it is theirs) and *upon* all that believe; for there is no difference; (none! Paul and you, Vinedresser, do not agree; where now, are your righteous in their own right?) For *all have sinned* and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely (How? By believing, or doing? No!) by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.' Not by any thing they can do! We now appeal to you, Vinedresser---Cannot we bring *one argument*, why God should not punish sinners endlessly? Yes, we can---we have brought it, and it is *sufficient!*

Vinedresser's *eleventh* paragraph, is as follows---'My opinion, Mr. Editor, is, that Christ is the *only* Mediator between God and man, (then our opinion, Mr. Vinedresser, is, that man has nothing to do, but wait until Christ has effected the Mediation; and if he *succeeds*, enjoy the benefit of it; and if Christ *fails*, and mankind find it out, *then*, they would do wisely to *try* themselves, and see what they can do! Tell no more about *conditions*---about our mediating!) but (he adds) at the hour of man's death, if he die in his sins, Christ's mediation and intercession for him is *irrecoverably gone!*' Pray, Vinedresser, how happens this? Where did you obtain your opinion? Is Christ deficient in *love* to *prompt*, or *power* to *execute*---or both? Let us see the opinion of the prophets and apostles on this head---theirs must have the preference to Vinedresser's. See Isaiah lxiii. 5. 'And I looked, and *there was* none to uphold; therefore, (wherefore? *Ans.* Because there was *none!*) *Mine own arm brought salvation!*' He is Almighty---power is not wanting! 'For I am persuaded, that neither *death*, nor life---nor angels, (devils, then, cannot,) nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.' Romans viii. 'God is Love.' Therefore, love is not *wanting*. There is but one obstacle in the way, and that is---Vinedresser's *opinion!*

Communication.

INFIDELITY CONSIDERED.

Continued from page 133.

Before I dismiss the subject of infidelity, I will give it a general view, a little further, as it respects faith, doctrine, and practice; for it will be found on the slightest examination, that all unsoundness of faith, and defects of doctrine and practice, have their origin in the spirit of infidelity; or in other words, in that spirit which confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, which is Antichrist, and consequently a deceiver.

Now as there is a great stir in the world about religion, not so much to promote truth and righteousness, as to maintain favourite systems and notions of religion, which is abundantly manifest by the show of religion, void of reality, exhibited by all sects and parties, and as without devotion to God, the soul must remain void of his righteousness and holiness, and so never be a partaker of his Divine nature, it behoveth all, both professors and non-professors, to be recipients thereof, that they may by it, *be* dignified with immortality, and crowned with eternal life. To ascertain in the first place how this is to be received, or how it is retained by the soul, will enable us to discover unsoundness of faith and its consequent defects. There is a medium by and through which every existence is brought into being. [Except the existence of the great First Cause, of which we can have no adequate idea.] The things of nature exist by the all creative power of God, through the spirit of nature; and the things of God, but by the Spirit of God; that is to say, the soul can be quickened and made alive in the image of God, *only by the operation* of his Holy Spirit *in the soul*. Now, if the soul was *really* the *offspring* and *essence* of Deity, in its *first* birth, as is the belief of almost all denominations that *it is* the breath of heaven, and therefore immortal, what *change* would it need, and could it be *changed* for the better? But so far from this, *is the fact*, that not only its willing contrarieties and acting diametrically opposite to God, and his holy teaching, but his dispensation to man, and even the words of Christ himself, 'Marvel not (that I say unto you that ye must be born again,' proves it to be otherwise. To effect this change which the soul in its natural first created state stands in need of, *is* the important point in question. It cannot be answered truly otherwise, than that the Spirit of God to produce its own offspring, it must be by its own operation. And who will say that the soul is not susceptible of this operation and really to be changed by it? It being clearly ascertained, that whatever our professions and faith may be, the soul standing in need of a change, that it may be an heir of God, and joint heir with Christ, and that this is to be effected by the operation of the Spirit of God in the soul, *is* abundantly evident.

First, from the nature of the soul itself: for if in its first creation it had been the essence and offspring of Deity, there would have been no need of laying man under any kind of restraint, or prohibitory law to keep him from unlawful or forbidden things; indeed to such a being, there could be no possibility of transgression or partaking of forbidden fruit, because to the holy, all things are holy, and to the pure all things are pure. And it would be as absurd to say that such a being could transgress, as that God himself could do wrong, for being really of God, in nature, and *essence*, he could no more counteract his will, than he could exist out of that nature, and out of that essence.

Secondly, from Scripture.—Here we find that man's component parts are of the earth, and that he had an animal life, and correspondent with this, he had a command to go forth, to multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it; *prior* to his being inspired with the breath of heaven, or Divine life, and receiving correspondent here with a prohibitory law to abstain from the knowledge of good and evil. This plainly shows and places the point in question beyond controversy, that man is *not*, but to be blessed, by the operation of the Spirit of God in his soul, because his needing the law, shows him to be an earthen creature, and entirely destitute of a life in God, only by his inspiration, and to retain this blessed communion was the very end of laying man under a restricting prohibitory law, with this unavoidable penalty annexed. 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.' Mark the consequence—this law was violated, and death ensued of course. What death? Ans. No other than that which was conferred by inspiration, and not only could, *but was* actually lost by interception. What interception could rob God of his prerogative, and exclude his Divine life from the soul? Could Omnipotence be dethroned from his seat of holiness in the soul, and leave it to the ravages of intruders? This some would say either robs God of his power, or that he gives place to intruders, and leaves the soul to their ravages. Hold, bold man, who art thou, who contendest against Omnipotence? Dost thou not behold his creation rising and falling in succession all round thee, and dost thou from thence conclude the former is because of his power, and the latter his weakness? So far from thus charging him with folly, is it not a

further proof of his Omnipotence, that he suffers the destroyer to come in and lay waste all that which was once fair and lovely, and from thence again restore life, order and beauty, in much greater perfection? If this is suffered to take place, to reanimate and beautify nature, can we call in question his suffering that lust to pervade the soul, which, when it conceives, brings forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, brings forth death? Certainly, we ought not, especially, when we know there *can be no* happiness to the soul, but that which is offered upon ground of its *own choice*. 'You have not chosen *me*, but I have *chosen you!*' Thus it is, he has chosen to bring us into being for the purpose of his own glory, and vouchsafed in order to perfect it, to give the soul Divine life under restricting *circumstances*, which are of every (part of creation or) tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the (source to derive knowledge, short of Divine wisdom or) tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou (art prohibited or) shall not touch it, for in the (very act of receiving knowledge but by my wisdom or) day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die. Thus restricted, having the sensation of Divine life in the soul, in addition to a life in common with all other animals, God has fitted and chosen man, and then upon the grounds of his (man's) own choice, permitted him to act, and meeted out his rewards accordingly—that upon obedience to the Spirit of Divine life in the soul, the fruit of this spirit of obedience is life eternal, and any want of this obedience is getting in the broad way, subject to the control and destruction of the spirit of the world, or natural man uninfluenced and without the preserving power of the inspiring Spirit of the Almighty, which giveth the spirit of man, not only an understanding in the things of God, but a life in him. This spirit of the world, thus rejecting and thereby without the animating presence of the inspiring Spirit of the Almighty Jehovah, *is in a state of darkness and death* as to any thing heavenly or Divine, and cannot be rewarded beyond what this world can give.

Thus it is with every soul that has been alive unto God. This life has been the effect of this inspiration, as certainly as the life of the body is by respiration in the air, or breath of this world, and both the former and the latter, equally die, as certainly as that causes produce their effects. For when inspiration is intercepted, from the soul and the air or breath of this world, from the body, they both instantly die. Thus, therefore, the doctrine both as to the life of the soul and body, is according to the law of grace and of nature, agreeable to the ordination of an all wise beneficent Creator, who willeth not the death of the soul that dieth, but that it should retain its integrity, firmly adhering to the spirit of inspiration, and by it be dignified with immortality and crowned with eternal life. And if it should go counter to the dictates of this inspiration of the Almighty, by the lusts of the flesh or the pride of life, which is enmity against God, is it not rational as that causes produce their effect, that *he will cease to be* the Divine life of such soul, and leave *it* as to any celestial animation in a state of spiritual death? Most certainly, for the soul that sinneth it shall die, as expressed particularly by the prophet Ezekiel, and he that doeth that which is lawful and right, shall save his soul alive; and not that sin could be transmitted from father to son, without his consent and actually joining with it. This would be as absurd in the nature of holiness, as that holiness could descend from godly parents to their posterity and constitute them a holy nation, a peculiar people zealous of good works. We do not find that the descendants of holy Enoch, good old Eli, and many others which might be mentioned, inherited holiness and virtue in consequence of being their offspring, but so far from it, Hophni and Phinehas were abominably wicked; neither are we to infer, that their wickedness was in consequence of their father's virtue. But to settle it as Jehovah has determined by the mouth of his prophet, 'The *soul that sinneth it shall die*,' without any relation or reference to predecessors or successors whatever, for these have nothing to do with it. 'Who can redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for his soul.' If Noah, Job, or Daniel, were with us, they could save neither son nor daughter. Nor could the combined virtue and holiness of all the sons of Adam, restore a dead soul to life. It remaineth for that power against which it revolted, and by which act it died, called in Scripture the Lion of the tribe of Judah! The Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, a Lamb slain from the foundation (of the spirit of) the world (in the soul) it is he, and he alone, that prevails to undo the heavy burden and let the oppressed go free, by opening the seven seals, which by sin and transgression seals the knowledge of the living God in every sense from his soul, and admits him into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. It was by this power, that Abel offered a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain, and that Enoch walked with God, and that all the righteous in all ages, received their inscription of holiness to the Lord, by this power, and this alone.

Had this Lamb, the Spirit of God, in and which is the Divine life of the soul, never been slain, that is, by doing despite to it by giving place to the devil, or which is the same thing, the spirit of the world, rejecting the lead and tendency, power and dominion, of the Divine spirit in man from the creation to the present day, how not only in renown but in reality, the whole human race would have been the sons of God, constituted in his holiness by a changing operation from nature to grace, or which is the same thing, by the operation of the Divine Spirit, the spirit of the world, the spirit of nature which is man's first life, would have been regenerated and changed from earthly to Divine affections. But it has been slain, that is, excluded a residence in the soul, though not by its own acts, neither by the preparation nor will of heaven, nor according to God's foreknowledge and decrees, agreeable to the belief of some, who assert, God knowing that Adam would transgress his command, prepared a sacrifice, that is slew his own Lamb-like spirit from the foundation of the world as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the elect, those whom he foreknew and predestinated to be agreeable to his own image. Others extend it as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. As to these sentiments, as well as all others, that have not their origin in the truth, they could never had a birth, only in the extinguishment of the Divine life in the soul. Upon this want of fidelity and chastity on the part of the soul to Christ, the Divine Spirit and its heavenly husband, this excellency has withdrawn itself, and the soul has become a prostitute to the spirit of the world, and from hence proceeds all false doctrine, and infidelity of every kind. Had the soul never departed from under Divine influence, inconceivably great to the natural man would have been its growth and establishment in spirit, and power, of the Most High, for eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of the natural man to conceive the good things which God hath in store for them that love him. Therefore, this is the criterion discriminating doctrine, namely, the life of God in the soul, that is, that spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come into the flesh of the confessor, which is of God, who cannot be known, but by his own Spirit. All other sources, whatever their names or natures may be, are infidel, and deserve no better appellation than the interlopers and comers before Christ, whom he styled thieves and robbers.

Thus, simply with the doctrine and faith in the indwelling of Christ, let us move forward in the examination of the faith and doctrine of Christian professors of the present day.

AN IMPARTIALIST.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Impartialist, in his *second* paragraph, asks—'Now if the soul was really the *offspring* and *essence* of Deity, in its first birth, &c., what change would it need, and could it be changed for the better?' Let us come to the point at once. What is meant by the '*essence* of Deity?' Surely, the *essence* of any thing, is the thing itself; at least so far, that it *possesses* all the *essential* properties of the thing. The word *essence*, therefore, is altogether mal-appropos; for no *man* ever did, or could possess all the *essential* properties of Deity, but the man Christ Jesus, who was 'God with us.' The Scriptures declare positively, that *man* is the *offspring* of God. The Scriptures declare, likewise, that man shall *return* to his *first* state—and that his *first* state was *upright*. In Number 32. p. 129. col. 3, and p. 130. in our answer to Dean, we have produced testimony from the Scriptures, which, we think, settles this question beyond the possibility of refutation; at least, we shall think so, until it is *refuted!*

We think it very important, that the words *regeneration*, and *resurrection* should be understood. Some have confounded them. The word uniformly translated *resurrection* is αναστασις—and the word in every instance translated *regeneration*, is παλιγγενεσια. The definition of the word translated *resurrection*, is, *to draw out—to cast out—to expel*. Hence, the prophet says, 'The earth shall *cast out the dead*.' The proper, and exclusive meaning of the word translated *regeneration*, is, *second beginning—renewing* and *restoring, to its former state—a return—a coming again*. This regeneration is the *washing* spoken of by Paul, in his Epistle to Titus. It is *salvation*—the *renewing* of our *nature in Christ*. But a *resurrection*, is the casting, or drawing out of mankind from the filth and corruption of their *vile bodies*, and placing them in a state, in which they can *receive*, and enjoy the *life* which was restored to them *in* Christ, when he *washed* them! If *our* definition is *wrong*, we will *thank* any man to set us *right*. If it is *truth*, we should be glad if all men would *believe* it! Should this view disagree with the preconceived opinions of any of our readers, let them consult their Bibles, instead of their prejudices, and after careful examination, give their opinions conscientiously on this *important* subject!

Impartialist in his *third* paragraph, contends, that the *soul* in its *first* creation (origin,) did not proceed, or was not the *offspring* of the Deity. And in his *fourth* paragraph, declares, that 'man had an *animal* life, and correspondent with this (i. e. at the same time) he had a command to go forth, &c. 'Now, we ask, if the *soul* did *not* at *first* proceed from *God*, from *whence* came it? Genesis i. 27. declares, that 'God created man in his image.' The 2d chap, 7th verse, declares *how* God made man; 'God formed man *of* the dust of the ground, and *breathed* into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.' Was not this the *breath* of *heaven*? The Scriptures farther declare, that 'God is the Father of the Spirits of all flesh.' Therefore, man received from God, (or if you please, was inspired with the breath of heaven with) a soul, and *afterwards* transgressed and *died!* The reader is requested to compare Impartialist's *third* paragraph, with the first and second chapters of Genesis and decide, whether it is 'according to the things written in the book.' The argument of Impartialist, is as follows: The soul cannot be the *offspring* of *Deity*, because it wills contrarieties, and *acts* diametrically *opposite* to *God*, &c. Is Impartialist a *father*? Does his children ever *act*, or *will different* from *himself*, or in any manner disobey him? If so, they are not *his* offspring. Let Impartialist examine his *premises*, and then, we think, he will not find fault with our examination of their *conclusions*.

The remark, that 'death was conferred by *inspiration*, and lost by *interception*,' is, to us, perfectly unintelligible. Were the Scriptures written in this obscure and unintelligible style, we should not be surprised at the confusion which at present exists in the modern Babel.

(To be Continued.)

To Correspondents.

Mysticus, 'Yours, &c.' *alias* Amator Veritatis, Witness, Reprehensor, and Dean, are received. Those of our correspondents, who have asked, 'Is it I,' in answer to our request, to be more accommodating in proportioning their *paper* to their *matter*, are informed, that we had no particular allusion to them, though we should be gratified, if they would apply it whenever necessary.

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1820. NO. 36.

Controversial.

COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR—The challenge given in your 15th No. and again repeated in your last, has induced me to trouble you with the following. You have challenged your readers 'to produce a single passage from the Scriptures in which it is *plainly* and *unequivocally* stated, that one act or deed is required of man, in default of the performance of which his soul shall be endlessly miserable, or in compliance with which, his soul shall be made endlessly happy in the enjoyment of eternal life' (No. 15. p. 60.) 'The condition' you say in your last (No. 33.) 'must be plainly stated, *endless happiness if complied with, and endless misery if neglected.*' We take it for granted, the Editor does not mean to cavil about words. For if he is to propose the *terms* in which this declaration is to be expressed, his *sine qua non* would be perfectly ridiculous. If the passage plainly and unequivocally declares this truth, in whatever language conveyed, his *sine qua non* is complied with.

I am perfectly aware that the production of such a passage, (and I mean to produce the declaration of the Lord himself) will be directly opposed to the Editor's doctrine of Universal salvation, and may therefore lead to controversy; but I will here premise, that I shall not on the present occasion enter any further upon the subject than simply to produce the passage, and show that the condition required is contained in it. It matters not whether it be in agreement with the *literal* meaning of many other parts of Scripture, when considered separately and by themselves, or not. I shall not undertake to reconcile the difficulties, or to harmonize the Scripture, that the Editor may produce in opposition to the truth here declared, because I am convinced that this would be a fruitless attempt; and yet I have no doubt there is perfect harmony throughout. But I shall content myself with doing what I think every mind, not entirely blinded by their preconceived opinions, will consider a full reply to the Editor's challenge.

In the Gospel according to St. Luke (chap. x. 25 to 37.] we are informed that 'a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him [Jesus] saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit *eternal life?*' [I take it for granted that the Editor will allow that the words '*eternal life*' mean 'endless happiness.' If not, there is an end of the argument, and I should think too, of common sense.] 'He said unto him, what is written in the *law?* How readest thou? And he answering, said, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, 'thou hast answered rightly; *this do and thou shalt live.*' Now here was a plain and direct question put to our Lord by this lawyer, demanding of him what he should *do* to inherit *eternal life.* How does our Lord reply to him? Not by telling him, friend, thou art mistaken in thy views of this matter; there is nothing that *thou* canst *do*, that will entitle thee to *endless happiness;* I have procured for thee or will procure for thee, that inestimable blessing; give thyself no concern about the matter: No. But he says to him, what is written in the law? How readest thou? To which he replies as above. And then our Lord says, '*This do* and *thou shalt live.*' [But here again I am taking things for granted, for I can hardly persuade myself, that the Editor will not admit that '*eternal life*' and the phrase '*to live*' are both synonymous with '*endless happiness.*' If not, as I said before, there is an end of the argument. Not but what this can be proved; but I have now neither leisure nor inclination to pursue it.] Now I appeal to your understanding, whether here is not a plain, *direct*, and explicit declaration, that to inherit *eternal life*, it is necessary to love the Lord our God with all our heart, mind, soul and strength, and our neighbour as ourselves? and whether this is not 'an act or deed' required of man, in compliance with which he shall be made endlessly happy in the enjoyment of eternal life?

Will you say this lawyer was a *Jew*, and therefore the Lord pointed him to the *Jewish law?* I answer; you say, 'Christ says the *law* and the prophets were until John, since which time the kingdom of God is preached, &c.' [No. 33. answer to C.] 'from which I infer, you mean to allege that the Gospel superseded the law. In one sense it did; and here lies your error. You confound the *ceremonial* with the *moral* law. The *ceremonial law* was indeed superseded by the Gospel, but the moral law (in which I mean to include the decalogue) was not superseded, but really more firmly established by the gospel, as a mean and rule of life. This truth, without going further, is clearly proved by the very circumstance I have adduced above, namely, our Lord's referring the inquirer after eternal life, to the observance of that law. For Christ came to teach men the way to eternal life, and to refer them to that which he himself had abolished, as incapable of conferring it, would have made him a false teacher.

There is another passage equally plain with the foregoing, declaring the performance of a *condition* on our part necessary to entitle us to enter into life. It is found in Matt. xix. 17. and in our Lord's reply to the young man who inquires of him, what good thing he should *do* to have eternal life. 'If thou wilt enter into life, says he, *keep the commandments.*'

I might here rest the subject; for it is indubitably true, the Editor's '*sine qua non*' to the contrary notwithstanding, that if the performance of a condition be necessary to entitle us to enter into life, then the *non-performance* of this condition necessarily *excludes* us from entering into life; which whether the Editor chooses to call by the name of *endless misery* or otherwise, does not alter the case. By the performance of the condition the soul is made *endlessly happy.* By neglecting to perform this condition, the soul *fails* of the *attainment* of *endless happiness.* Call it what you please.

But I go further; I will produce the passage proving that the *non-performance* of a *required condition* leaves the soul in *endless misery.* Not where those *express terms* are used; for, as we said before, we cannot believe the Editor means to prescribe the *language*, and then say produce it; this, as we observed, would make his *sine qua non* ridiculous.

In the 3d chap. of John, 36th verse, it is said by the Lord himself, '*he that believeth* on the Son hath *everlasting life;* and he that *believeth not* the Son, shall *not see life;* but the wrath of God abideth on him.'

Now if I have any understanding of language, a plainer declaration than this is not contained in all the Bible. *Faith on the Son* is here the *condition* of salvation; or of *everlasting life.* The want of it, the cause of *endless misery.* For if to *see life*, be *everlasting happiness*, [the terms are synonymous] then *not to see life* is *everlasting misery*, and more particularly, when it is said to be the occasion of the *wrath of God* abiding on him.

Thus, I think, the challenge has been answered. To evade the force of those passages by quoting and comparing them with others, or by setting them in opposition to certain doctrines alleged to be taught in the Scriptures, will not answer. I consider them still as standing unimpeached. Do they not unequivocally assert *conditions?* Let the candid answer the inquiry.

J. C**.

ANSWER.

It is with pleasure we see the long contested question, in a state of approximation to a close. Our correspondent, J.C. although he *indirectly* complies with our *sine qua non*, he *directly* gives his assent to a *criterion*, and lends his authority to establish *premises*, which we are quite willing shall be *umpire*, and decide in all matters *undecided* by the *Scriptures*, the word of God! J. C. in his first paragraph, says, 'We take it for granted, the Editor does not mean to *cavil about words.* For if he is to propose *the terms* in which this declaration is to be *expressed*, his *sine qua non* would be perfectly ridiculous. If the passage plainly, and unequivocally, declares this truth, in *whatever* language conveyed, his *sine qua non* is complied with.' Pray, in what terms is the position or doctrine conveyed, which we object to? If it is plainly, and unequivocally declared, we can do no more. If it is not plainly, and unequivocally declared, our opponents have no right to declare it is! Our opponents declare, that endless misery shall be the fate of all those, who do not comply with the conditions of the Gospel. WE PROPOSE NO TERMS!!! They have proposed the terms—we only wish them to prove from the Scriptures, that these are the terms, and that the endless misery they speak of, will inevitably await all those, who do not comply with these terms! We appeal to the conscience of J. C. for the propriety and justice of the ground we have taken; and whatever answer may proceed from his *mouth*, or his pen, we know we shall receive a favourable verdict! We repeat it—we have proposed no terms—our opponents have proposed terms—we have only recapitulated their terms—for we declare, there are no terms—nay, more—salvation is 'without money, and without price!' J.C. in his second paragraph, expresses a wish to avoid controversy, or reply, and says, 'I shall not undertake to reconcile the difficulties, or to harmonize the Scripture, that the Editor may produce in opposition to the truth here declared; because I am convinced, that this would be a fruitless attempt; and yet I have no doubt, that there is perfect harmony throughout.' That is, 'there is perfect harmony throughout,' between the Scripture, and my opinion, or belief in endless misery. We should do J. C. injustice, did we not confess, that we think his precaution a very necessary one. And we take the liberty to inform him, that truth, and truth alone, harmonizes with the Scriptures. And that the spiritual understanding of them, if we take Christ in evidence, is life and not endless misery; for Christ says, 'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.' Therefore, there is no harmony in the Scriptures with endless misery.

J. C. in his third paragraph, introduces the condition, as follows—'In the Gospel according to St. Luke, &c., we are informed, that a 'certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, [Jesus] saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? [I take it for granted, that the Editor will allow that the words 'eternal life,' mean endless happiness. If not, there is an end of the argument; and I should think too, of common sense.] 'He said unto him, what is written in the law? How readest thou? And he answering, said, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered rightly. This do, and thou shalt live.' Now, *we* have a question to put to J. C. for we think, that he has introduced this, in this manner, to *tempt us!* Namely—Do you believe that endless misery awaits all those, who do not *love*

the *Lord* their God with *all* their heart, &c., and their *neighbour* as *themselves?* Did *you* ever *refuse* to do that for your *neighbour*, which you would, in *similar* circumstances, do for *yourself?* We appeal to your *conscience!* Do you love *any* thing *beside* your God? Ans. Here are no difficult passages of scripture to *harmonize!* Answer our questions—we demand it of you—nay more—if you answer them in the negative, your conscience will give you the *lie direct!* And if you answer them in the affirmative, you seal your *own* eternal damnation, and *endless misery* is *your* portion! Now, we take it for granted, that without *perfect obedience*, there is an *end* to all *hopes* of happiness, on J. C's. plan; 'and we should think too, of common sense!' There is, however, two passages of Scripture which we shall quote, and we shall excuse J. C. from the trouble of *harmonizing* them with *his* doctrine, and for a reason, which, we think, is too obvious to mention. Namely—'If we say we have no sin, we *deceive* ourselves, and the *truth* is not in *us*. By the *law* shall no flesh be *justified* in his sight. (Why?) For by the *law* is the knowledge of *sin*.' J. C. continues—'Now here was a plain, and direct question put to our Lord by this lawyer, demanding of him what *he should do*, to inherit *eternal life*.' J. C. is requested to notice, that the lawyer did not go to Christ in a *humble* mind, wishing to be *instructed*; but went to *tempt* Christ. He did not ask Christ, how he *could* be *saved*—but what *he* should *do*—I—What shall I *do!* Now what answer could Christ, under such circumstances, make? We answer—no other than he did make. And it carried condemnation to the lawyer, and it carries condemnation to the conscience of J. C. Now we think J. C. has omitted *one* condition; and we, wishing him to be saved, and presuming that he is sincere, we advertise him of it. Christ told a young man, who applied to him to know what *he* should *do*, after hearing him *boast* of his goodness, 'Thou lackest one thing yet, *sell all* that thou *hast*, and *give* to the *poor*,' &c. This answer, we are informed, made the 'young man go away sorrowful;' and we are grossly mistaken, if the mere recapitulation of it, does not make J. C. feel sorrowful too!

J. C. continues—'How does our Lord reply to him? Not by telling him, Friend, thou art *mistaken* in thy views of this matter: there is nothing that *thou* canst *do* that will entitle thee to *endless happiness*;' [Quere. We ask J. C. if there is any thing that he can do to entitle *him* to *endless happiness*, if *perfect obedience* is the *only* thing which can *procure* it?] I have procured for thee, or will procure for thee, that inestimable blessing;—give thyself no concern about the matter. No;—but he says to him, What is written in the law? How readest thou? To which he replies, as above. And our Lord says, 'This do, and thou shalt live!' Our blessed Lord told the truth! No man *can* procure himself eternal life, but by being holy, as God is holy. God be praised, his righteousness is ours—Christ *for* and *with* us, rendered *perfect* obedience to the law; and the testimony of Paul is truth, 'But now the righteousness of God *without* the *law* is manifested, being witnessed by the law (itself) and the prophets, even the righteousness of God which is by faith of *Jesus* Christ unto *all*,' &c. And as J. C. observes, 'But here I am taking things for granted, for I can hardly persuade myself, that the Editor will not admit that '*eternal life*,' and the phrase '*to live*,' are both synonymous with endless happiness.' So J. C. will admit, that the righteousness of God is eternal life, or will procure it! God, surely is perfect. And his righteousness is *perfect*; and it harmonizes with the Scripture, which says,—'I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live *for ever*, and the bread that I *will give*, is my flesh, which I *will give* for the *life* of the *world*.' John vi. 51. Is not this, procuring for the world 'this inestimable blessing?' We shall not adopt the phraseology of J. C. and say, 'If not there is an end of the argument;' for we assure him, that our arguments are, at least, coexistent with the objections which require them, and that we shall pursue the *error* while we live! J. C. continues—'Now I appeal to your understanding, whether here is not a plain *direct*, and explicit declaration, that to inherit *eternal life*, it is necessary to love the Lord our God with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength, and our neighbour as ourselves? And, whether this is not an *act*, or deed, *required* of man, in *compliance* with which he shall be made *endlessly happy* in the enjoyment of eternal life?' Now we are quite willing to acknowledge, that the man who *does all this*, shall live as long as J. C. pleases to have him. We, however, have a question to ask—Does this passage[in Luke]'*plainly* and *unequivocally* declare,' that *those* who do *not* 'love the *Lord* our God with *all their heart*, &c., and their *neighbour* as *themselves*,' shall be *endlessly* miserable? If *not*, then our *sine qua non* is *not* complied with!

In answer to J. C's. *fourth* paragraph, we have only to observe, that Christ declared, '*I am* the *way*, the truth, and the *life*.' Not the *law*. We believe the *law* of God in its *purity*, and Divine requirements, is *co-existent with* God himself! And we further challenge J. C. and all others, to produce one passage, where Christ preached salvation by the *works of any law?* In the passage under consideration, a lawyer came to Christ, *tempting* him. If you please, trying *him* [Christ,] not to find out the *way* of salvation! Neither did this lawyer *ask* Christ the *way* of salvation. 'But, *what* shall *I* do?' Could this lawyer *save himself?* If so, Christ is *not* the *only* Saviour! We repeat it, this lawyer did *not ask*, *how* he should be *saved;* humbly *inquiring* the *way* of salvation. 'But, 'Master, what shall *I do!*' I, myself! I want no help! Tell me what is to be done—and I,—I will do the work—I am *mighty to save!* Christ told him. And we tell all men, who ask what *they shall do*, that they must render *perfect obedience* to the *law* of God, and be as *holy* as *God* is holy! Nay, more, we tell all men who *seek* salvation by their *own* works in *conformity* to or under the *law*, that they never will *have life*, [call it by any name you please] until they have rendered *perfect* obedience to the *law* of God! [Let no man after this call *us Antinomians!*] And *we have done this!* Christ is the Head—we are the members of his body! And the Head, with, and for the members, rendered perfect obedience to the *law*. For proof of this, see 1 Cor. i. 30. Rom. iii. 22. And we triumphantly exclaim, we have the *oath* of Jehovah, that 'every tongue shall swear—surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.' Isaiah xlv. 23, 24. Produce the condition 'if you can!' Must we be wise? Christ is made unto us *wisdom!* Is holiness, or sanctification, an indispensable qualification? Christ is made unto us *sanctification!* Do you say, we must have something to redeem us from the sins we have committed? We answer—Christ hath done all, and it is ours! He is made unto us *redemption!* Ransack creation, and produce one condition which we have not already complied with! The work is done! J. C. should have brought his conditions before! We have complied with them *all!* And Christ, our Head, has said, 'Because I live, ye shall live also!' Not because you have believed, and done the things commanded you. Well does the apostle declare, 'I am persuaded, that neither life, nor death, &c., nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord!' Can *sin* separate us from this love? No! Never! 'For God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us,' Rom. v. 8. God is unchangeable! And the salvation of the world is as sure, as God is sure! His immutability is *our* guarantee—and we want no better! We believe God; and in the words of the apostle, 'We both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men; specially of those that believe.' We have experienced this special salvation, 'for we, [says the same apostle] who have believed do enter into rest' Here is cause and effect. One cannot exist without the other. We ask all men—Have you entered into rest? Can you say, in the language of the apostle, 'I am persuaded that neither life, nor death, &c., shall be able to separate us from the love of God, &c.? For we know, [not hope and fear] that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.'

J. C. in his *fifth* paragraph, introduces another quotation from Matt. xix. 17. 'The young man enquired of him [Christ,] what *good* thing *he* should *do* to have eternal life. [Christ replies] 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' J. C. however, omitted a part—'Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be *perfect*, go, sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor,' &c. Is not perfection necessary? We again ask, Does this passage '*plainly*, and *unequivocally declare*,' that *those* who do *not* this, shall be *endlessly miserable?* No! If it did, we should tremble for J. C! J. C. adds, 'I might here *rest* the subject; for it is indubitably true, the Editor's '*sine qua non*' to the contrary notwithstanding, that if the performance of a condition be necessary to entitle us to enter into life, then, the *non-performance* of this condition, *necessarily excludes* us from entering into life; which, whether the Editor chooses to call by the name of endless misery, or otherwise, does not alter the case,' &c. We tell J. C. plainly, that if he *rests* the subject here, he will not *rest* himself! We tell J. C. farther, that if he believes the performance of these conditions are necessary to entitle him to heaven—he will be excluded from heaven; or in other words, he will not enter into rest, until he believes he has performed them; or believes Christ has done it, and his [Christ's] righteousness is his! And we have no hesitation in saying, that if J. C. continues in his present unbelieving state, relative to the righteousness of Christ, being the righteousness of the members of his body [all men] endlessly—he will be endlessly miserable! For we have not the credulity to believe that J. C. will ever make the sacrifice of his property, and besides, keep all the commandments, which, if we believe him, must be done, or endless misery is his portion! Quere. Would J. C. submit to endless misery, if he knew he could avoid it by giving all his property to the poor? Would J. C. hesitate a moment, if he really believed this was the *sine qua non?* We shall let him answer these questions at his leisure!

Again, we remark that the passage from Matt. is similar to the one from Luke. The young man asked, what he should do; and Christ told him. We are instructed, that the young man was sorrowful; and we think this will be the case with J. C. We ask J. C. how the non-performance of a condition can exclude any man from heaven, when we are 'saved by grace, through faith, and that not of ourselves; (Why? Ans.) it is the gift of God!!' The following will illustrate the subject. J. C (the lawyer,) goes to the market, and asks the seller, Master, what shall I give you (what good thing shall I do) for a piece of beef? He is told, Give me one *dollar* and the beef is your's! (Keep the commandments, &c.,) A. B. goes to the market, and says, I have *no dollar*—*I* must eat or starve! Master, *how* (not, what do you ask!) shall I obtain provision for myself and family? The master tells him, The meat is your's—believe—take it and rejoice! 'Believe,' said Paul, and Silas, to the Jailer, 'and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.' And we are authorized by God, to say, that the time is coming, when at the name of Jesus, (Saviour) every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear.'

J. C. continues—'But I go further. I will produce the passage, proving that the non-performance of a required condition leaves the soul in endless misery. Not where those express terms are used; [*ah*—'there's the rub!' Pray, what right have you to use them, if Christ *did not?*] for as I said before, we cannot believe the Editor means to prescribe the language, and then say, produce it. [No! But we can believe that J. C. has prescribed the language; and we say, produce it, if you can!] This, as we observed, would make his *sine qua non* ridiculous.' True—but the language has been prescribed by our opponents; and we only want them to 'stick to their text;' and then, let the ridicule shift for itself, it would be no concern of ours! Let us examine this. J. C. says, 'I will produce the passage, proving the non-performance of a required condition, leaves the soul in endless misery.' Reader, look at it—'In John iii. 36. [says J. C.] it is said by the Lord himself, 'He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.' Would to heaven J. C. believed

his! And not him alone, but all men. It is not possible for human reason to conceive of any truth' or position whatever, that we more *fully* believe' than *we believe* these words of Christ, in their *most extensive sense!* Our very existence is not more evident to us, than the truth contained in this, to us, *consoling* declaration. It is a *main pillar* in the doctrine of the salvation of all men! Nay, more—it is not with us a mere matter of belief; for we *rejoice* in it! It is *life*, and not death! It is to us an evidence of the truth of the declaration, that 'Man shall live by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' What is it to believe? What is *faith*? Will a man's believing a thing make it true? Must not a thing, or principle, be true, *before* we *believe* it; or will our believing *make* that *true*, which was not true before we believed it? 'He that *believeth* on the *Son hath* everlasting life.' What is it to believe on the Son? Is it possible for that man to have (or enjoy) everlasting life, who believes Christ will damn him, and torment him for ever? No! It is not possible. Is it *possible* for a man to have everlasting life, by believing Christ to be *his Saviour*, if he is *not* his Saviour? We think none will contend for this. Christ, then, *must* be the man's Saviour, *before* he *believes*, or the man believes a *lie*, or *makes* that *true*, by *believing*, which was *not* true *before!* Now mankind are called upon to *believe a truth*. Namely, 'God is the Saviour of all men, *specially* of those that believe.' If a *man's* faith makes that *truth*, which was *not* truth, or had *no* existence (the same thing) *before* he *believed* it, then the doctrine of salvation by Christ, &c., is an idle tale! The special salvation is explained. He that believeth, *hath* (specially enjoys it, by believing the truth,) everlasting life. He that believeth not (says John, makes God a liar,' How? Ans. because he believes not the record, &c.,) shall not see life and (Is there *any* life for him to see? According to the common opinion there is none, and because he does not see, what has no existence,) the wrath of God abideth on him.' How does the wrath of God abide on him? Ans. 'The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness.' Then every man who cannot *see himself* in *Christ*, reconciled to God, must have in his own mind an apprehension, that the wrath of God abideth on *him!* Is it possible for a man to believe on the testimony of God, that Christ is the Saviour of all *men*, without believing that he is *his* Saviour? No, it is impossible. Is it possible for a man to believe Christ to be his Saviour, and to have the wrath of his heavenly Father abiding on him? No! Never! Is it possible for an *unbeliever* to see *life*, when he does not believe that *Christ is his life*? No! It is *not* possible! Was there *ever* an *unbeliever*, on whom the wrath of God abided, who ever *escaped* from the *endless misery*, which J. C. says, is to be the fate of those who *do not see life*? Ans. If there *ever was* a man, who *ever was* an *unbeliever*, and *afterwards believed*, he either *must* have *suffered endless misery*, or the declaration of *Christ*, namely, 'He that believeth on the Son *hath everlasting life*,' must be *false*—or endless misery, and everlasting life, are *synonymous terms!* Here are the *premises*, and we challenge all creation to avoid their *conclusions!!!* If ONE man can be found, who was *once* an *unbeliever*, and *escaped* endless misery, J. C's. hypothesis is gone 'like the baseless fabric of a vision, and leaves not a wreck behind!' We shall instance Paul, as one remarkable for his infidelity; as respected his belief on the Son, and who even carried his rancour so far, that he persecuted, even unto death, those who did believe. What think you? Will Paul be endlessly miserable? Or is J. C. mistaken—one, or the other, must be the case. This, however, we shall leave to the good sense of the reader to determine! J. C. adds—'Then *not* to see life, is everlasting misery, and more particularly, when it is said to be the *occasion* of the wrath of God abiding on him.' Here, then, is *cause* and *effect*. Prove that the *cause* will be *endless*, and we shall freely acknowledge, that the *effect* will be *endless* also. This you can never do! We, however, *can prove* that the *cause* shall *cease*, and the *effect* ceases of course. And further, we can prove that the *effect* will cease, then the *cause* ceases. The cause is sin. The prophet said of Christ, that he should 'Finish transgression, and make an end of sin.' Then the *cause* shall cease. Farther, 'He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces.' Then the *effect* will cease.

The concluding paragraph of J. C. we shall leave to the reader, whose remarks, we think, will be quite sufficient.

We think proper, however, before we dismiss the subject, to notice a *trifling* incongruity in the reasoning of J. C. He in the first place, contends, that all those will be endlessly miserable, who do not love the Lord with all their heart, &c.; then, all those will be endlessly miserable, who do not keep all the commandments, (we added, here, what he omitted; we presume he will not object to the *whole*, as he is fond of conditions) and sell all their goods and give to the poor. And then, with unexampled *cruelty*, damns with endless misery all who do not believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; a condition altogether different, and not included in his first, or second, set of terms, or conditions! We think a species of dealing like this, in bargains, and agreements, and conditions, in our world, where the *pocket* is concerned, would subject a man to severe animadversions—but in religion, it seems, you may *shuffle* as much as you please!

J. C. in his *second* paragraph, remarked, 'I shall not undertake to reconcile the difficulties, or to harmonize the Scriptures, that the Editor may produce in opposition to the *truth* here declared, because, I am convinced, that this would be a fruitless attempt,' &c. If J. C. will *harmonize* the Scriptures he has brought forward, and reconcile them to each other, and all, to his endless misery, and conditions, we shall readily excuse him the trouble of harmonizing our quotations, for the reason he himself has assigned!

Middletown, Nov. 27, 1820.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—The following passage of Scripture is submitted for your consideration, with an earnest request, that you will give it a place in your paper, together with an exposition relative to its most extensive meaning. Revelation xxii. 11. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." Who are the unjust and filthy, spoken of? And *when*, and *where*, will it be said of them, they are *unjust*, and let them remain so? Who are the *righteous*, and *holy*? And why is there such a *distinction* made between the *two* characters?

An Attentive Reader of the Gospel Herald.

REVELATION XXII. 11.

'*He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still.*'

If it were possible to produce one passage of the sacred writings, which has been the victim of outrageous perversion more than another, we should have no hesitation in saying, *this is the one!* When *money* is in question, men are required to be consistent, and tell a straight story; but, when the *never-ending* existence and welfare of the soul is talked of, the more inconsistent and absurd your conclusions are, the better; and the measure of approbation you receive, depends upon the *uncertainty* of your *premises*, and inconsistency, and absurdity of your *conclusions!* The Apocalypse is said to be very *mysterious*---hard to be understood--'*no body knows the meaning of it*'—this is in almost every man's mouth; and strange to tell, the very persons who utter this plain confession of their *ignorance*, are the very first to give it a definition; and *one too*, which if it were truth, would *damn them eternally* in the strictest sense of the term!

That the reader may at one view behold the prodigious contrast between truth and error, we shall briefly examine the doctrine which those who prefer exclusive claims to orthodoxy have squeezed out of it. The time spoken of, is said to be the *day of judgment*, at the final consummation of all things—those interested, are all the *human race*—and the succeeding, the 12th verse, 'And behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his works shall be,' is adduced, and declared, to prove, that at that time every man will be judged according to the deeds done in the body---then they produce the declaration, 'He that is *unjust*, let him be unjust still,' &c. And in addition to this, is the positive assertion, 'there will be no change *after* death!' This is what is called the orthodox view; if a man believes this, he is a Christian; if he doubts, he is damned; but, if he denies in toto, the truth of it, he is immediately pronounced a *Universalist*, and is, as in 'days of yore,' spoken against by all the world! We deny it in toto! But, we shall for a moment *humour* our *friends*, and taking it for granted to be truth, reason accordingly. We premise, however, that these are the premises of our friends, and we think they are in conscience bound, not to blame us for the conclusions which inevitably flow from them! We assure them, that we would do something better for them if we could, for we really *pity* them; but the materials are such, that nothing better can be produced from them!

At the day of judgment, then, all mankind are to be judged according to the deeds done in (not out of) the body. The meritorious intercession and mediation of Christ has nothing to do with the matter! No, nothing.---This conclusion our friends must accept with as good a grace as possible; for we assure them it is a child of their own! The law of God, which was given by Moses, is the law by which their actions are to be determined filthy, or holy, righteous, or unrighteous! Now, the Apostle James, declares, 'For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in *one* point, he is guilty of *all*.' Then he must be very filthy and unrighteous, to be guilty of offending against the *whole law* of God. And the same apostle declares, 'For in many things we (including himself) offend all!' Let us look at the law—What says the law? Ans. 'Thou shalt not covet—Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Every man, therefore, who ever coveted any thing he saw, and which did not belong to him, is filthy—Every man who does not love his neighbour as himself, is unrighteous! The law says, 'The *seventh* day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work.' Now the violation of this one command, and the substitution of the *first* day of the week, instead of it, is, according to the view of the subject under consideration, a wilful violation of the law of God, and eternal damnation will be the consequence! It is in vain to attempt to get clear of this. If there is truth in the premises, there must be truth in the conclusions! Produce one testimony from the Scriptures, which by any reasonable mode of construction, will authorize our preachers of Moses to neglect the observance of the seventh day of the week, in the manner commanded by God? You cannot do it! Produce one man who will stand this test, and bear the scrutiny of this law, if you can! The Scriptures declare expressly—'There is none good, no, not one.' All, therefore, are filthy, and unrighteous. What kind of reward will the best men get at the day of judgment, if they are to be rewarded according to their works, and their works are to be judged according to the law of Moses? Remember, 'He that offends in *one* point, is guilty of *all*.' And it will then be declared, He that is filthy, (guilty of all) let him be filthy (guilty of all) still! Well may it be said, 'O Lord, if thou shouldest be strict to mark iniquity, who could stand?' But according to this view of the subject, God will be strict to mark iniquity; for 'every man shall be rewarded, as his work shall be.' There is to be *no change after death!* The punctilious Baptist, who refuses in this world to hold communion with any other denomination of professing Christians, will in heaven keep his *own corner*, nor suffer himself to be polluted with the touch of those, in his opinion, filthy and unrighteous! The Arminian will despise the Calvinist, and shoot the finger at him, as he passes by---while the Calvinist damns him for an heretic! And the poor despised Universalist, if one should be so fortunate as to get there, however affectionate-

ly he may feel towards all parties, will be *execrated* and *hated* by the *whole!* Reader, whatever of the ridiculous or absurd may appear in this, we are innocent; you must charge the whole upon the *premises!* The Calvinists and Hopkinsians, however, who contend stoutly that there is *no change after death*, would do well to consider this a *terrible satire* upon their *present* dispositions. For if in a future state they can behold with rapturous delight the writhing tortures of their children, and their exultation and joy increase with their torments, they, if we can believe them, possess even in this life this heavenly disposition, and are obliged to stifle it on account of the hellish notions of those they are compelled to associate with! Reader, what a blessed place our earth would be, if this heaven was begun here, and every father constantly manifested towards his children, this inexpressibly tender and loving disposition? Presuming the reader has seen enough of the error to be disgusted with it, we proceed to the truth!

Nearly eighteen hundred years have rolled away, since the words which are the subject under consideration were spoken. John, the revealer (or relator) was in a vision in the Island of Patmos. Christ, the Saviour of the world, appeared unto John, and commanded him, 'Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter.' The reader is requested to notice the order—namely, *past*, (thou *hast* seen) *present* (the things which *are*) *future*, (the things which shall be *hereafter*.) If it is said, that the expression, 'the things which shall be hereafter,' has an exclusive reference to a future state of being when the things of time and sense are passed away, and eternity has commenced with all men; we answer—by the same rule, the expression, 'the things thou (in the past tense) *hast* seen,' has an exclusive reference to eternity before man was! This, we believe, cannot be controverted.

(To be Continued.)

DOCTOR ADAM CLARKE.

We earnestly request all Methodists to examine the following, which is quoted from Dr. C. their *Grand Lama!* Discoursing on the 'Principles of the Christian religion,' he says, 'It was also necessary that this Redeemer should be infinitely *Divine* and perfect; as the end of his great undertaking was, not only to purchase pardon for a world of offenders, but to merit eternal happiness for mankind. Now an infinite happiness cannot be purchased by any price less than that which is infinite in value; and an infinity of merit can only result from a nature that is infinitely Divine or perfect.' Again—'After the resurrection comes the general judgment, in which God shall render unto every man according as his works have been,' &c. Reader, the Scriptures no where declare this! But the Scriptures do declare, that 'All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.' Compare this with our first quotation from Dr. C. 'Christ has purchased pardon!' What do you think of this? Answer, as you expect to give account to God! Here is no sophistry, nor subterfuge. Dr. C. declares, 'Now an infinite happiness cannot be purchased by any price less than that which is infinite in value!' We ask you—Is your tears, or works, or repentance, 'infinite in value?' No! You know they are not! Shall not Christ have the possession which he has purchased, namely—the world—all mankind—for Dr. C. says, he has paid an infinite price for them? Dr. C. has declared what the end of Christ's great undertaking was; will it not be accomplished? Will those be endlessly miserable, for whom Christ has merited eternal happiness? If you say, no! you acknowledge the salvation of all men—If you say, yes, you give the Scriptures the lie direct, which say, of all, that they 'are justified freely by his grace; much more then, being now justified by his blood, (not by our faith, or works, or repentance,) we shall be saved from wrath through him;' not through our repentance or works! The Doctor farther says, 'Pardon, or forgiveness of sin, implies, that the man's guilt is taken away; and that he is no longer in DANGER of falling into endless punishment.' Now read this—'The true penitent should continue to watch and pray till he is justified; (Quere. Will praying justify him?) that, when justified, he should continue to watch and pray, and deny himself, and take up his cross, till he is sanctified; (Quere. Will watching, &c. sanctify him?) and when sanctified, he should continue the same course, believing, loving, and obeying, till he is glorified. (Quere. Will the same course glorify him? Where is the infinite merit of Christ, all this time?) As he will be in DANGER as long as he lives, of FALLING from GRACE!' Quere. After he has fallen from grace, what then? Dr. C. says, 'He is no longer in DANGER of falling into endless punishment! There are but two alternatives for Dr. C. Either admit that a man can, according to this view, be saved without this grace, or, that his declaration, that 'he is no longer in DANGER of falling into endless punishment,' is an absolute *falsehood!*

We recommend it to the Methodists, to take this into consideration. Nay, more—We ask them, How can you answer to your consciences, for publishing and circulating such notorious inconsistencies and falsehoods in the world?

'To the law, and the testimony---If you speak not according to the things written in the Book, it is because there is no light in you!'

Choose this day, whether you will have Adam Clarke, or Jesus Christ, for your *instructor!*

'Ye cannot serve God and mammon !!!'

REMARKS ON IMPARTIALIST.

[CONCLUDED.]

In our last, we mentioned that our remarks would be *continued*. But having given Impartialist's communication an attentive reading since it was printed, we have thought proper to say no more about it, at least, at present. We have two special reasons for this—our correspondents are at present liberal in their favours, and the communication in question, is so obscure, that we think further remarks are not necessary. We, however, inform Impartialist, that in our opinion he is writing to very little purpose; and without he adopts a style, and makes use of a phraseology less obscure, he might as well write *Arabic*, for any benefit his readers will receive from his labours. We do not say this with a view to offend; but to induce Impartialist to retrace his steps, and travel in the *plain road* he *started in*.

PUNCTILIO!

Notice is hereby given, that in future no manuscript found in our letter-box, will be considered as a communication, or intended for publication, or will be published in the 'Gospel Herald;' unless it is directed to '*The Editor of the Gospel Herald*;' or in the address, the words '*Gospel Herald*' are *expressed*, and the declaration, that it is *intended* for *publication* in the *same*, is directly expressed, &c. Those persons who have declared that they cannot *conscientiously* do this, are informed, that we have no *jurisdiction* over their *consciences*, and are quite willing *they* should cherish as many scruples as they please; but it must be on the condition (and a *sine qua non*, too,) of having liberty to *cherish our own!*

All we ask of our punctilious friends, is, to *be consistent*; and take as good care of their *gospels*, as they do of their *consciences!*

Note. The Gospel, Paul says, God preached to Abraham, is the Gospel *we* preach. And our motto, "Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people," is the only criterion we shall consent to be judged by, in connexion with the preaching of God; namely—"In Christ shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

Brethren, examine yourselves, whether you are in the faith. *Paul.*

"How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring *glad tidings of good* things." Romans x. 15. Reader, please to *reverse* this, and apply it to the *fire and brimstone* preachers of the present day!

MISSIONARIES.

The "COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER" of Nov. 30, contains an appeal to the charitable feelings of the good people of the city of New-York, in the shape of an address, signed by Robt. Ralston of Philadelphia, and Divie Bethune of New-York, and an Editorial recommendation of the same, &c; in which the object stated, is, to "Extinguish the *funeral fires*, which annually light so many victims of *ignorance* and *superstition* into eternity, &c." And to enlighten the minds of those, who are "wholly given to *idolatry*, and instigated to self-murder by the *accursed* doctrines of their *Shaster*, &c."

Now, we should think the preaching of our Calvinistic Missionaries, who deal largely in 'fire and brimstone,' would frighten them from their purpose and *scare* them into a conversion, did not *facts* at *home* stare us in the face, and prove the contrary! Within *six months*, the 'accursed Shasters,' known by the names of 'CALVIN'S INSTITUTES,' and 'HOPKINS' SYSTEM OF DOCTRINES,' have made FOUR victims in a country of eight millions of inhabitants, which is as many, we believe, as are sacrificed in the missionary field, of one hundred and fifty millions, considering the difference of population. The 'accursed Shaster' of idolatrous India, teaches a *momentary* fire; but the 'accursed Shasters' of America, teach an *interminable* burning? It is in vain to deny it---the difference is all in favour of the Pagans! True, they think it is pleasing to their god, to suffer fire for a moment—their 'accursed Shaster' tells them so—but the 'accursed American Shasters,' will tell them of a god, who made them on purpose to burn them FOR EVER!' We repeat it---the difference is all in favour of the Pagans; and were they made acquainted with the 'accursed Shasters' of America, we verily believe they would send us a missionary, and commiserate in a becoming manner the delusions of their infatuated brethren!!!

Quere. If '67 dollars' will pay the salary of a minister in India, would it not be good policy to dispense with one who receives 3500 dollars, which will support 52 preachers in India, where they are so much wanted? This deserves consideration!

'Fearfulness hath surprised the Hypocrites.'

ISAIAH XXXIII. 14.

The 'RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER,' *alias*, advocate for Calvinism, (of Dec. 16.) published at New-Haven, under the head, 'On the Justice of God, contains what is purported to be a letter from a *once* 'Universalist minister,' acknowledging his *errors*, and abjuring the doctrine of 'Universal salvation,' &c. In this letter, he acknowledges that he was a 'SOCINIAN!' And 'REJECTED the SAVIOUR!' Now, we say, as John said,—'They went out from us, but they were not *of us;* for had they been of us, they would have continued with us.' If this 'J. R.' (for he does not tell *his name*,) will step into our columns, his former *hypocrisy*, and present *ignorance* and *impiety*, shall be made manifest! More of this, if we have opportunity.

To Correspondents.

In our notice to correspondents, see Number 32, the receipt of Edward Sharman of Springfield, N.J. is acknowledged. According to precedence, established by the order in which it was received, this communication should have been published in this paper. But, on attempting to read, in order to answer it, if necessary, we found it written in the *modern fashionable style*, and so close, that the lines not only touch, but intersect one another, and we desisted from further examination, (it being quite lengthy) and the printer declaring that he can not print it without it is transcribed, and we not being under advantages to undertake the job, we are under the disagreeable necessity of requesting the writer to call or send at the office, and get the manuscript, and transcribe it legibly for publication; when we shall publish it with pleasure. The writer, if we were to judge by this specimen of his ability, can, if he pleases, write *legibly*, as well as *fashionably*. And we presume on taking the trouble to copy the manuscript, he will feel very sensibly the reasonableness of our request, &c.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1820. NO. 37.

Exposition of Revelation xxii. 11.

[CONCLUDED.]

"He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still."

OUR exposition of the passage in question must be brief; or we should exceed our limits. Consequently, we can only allude to the connexion and context, &c. Christ is a Prophet, Priest, and King. As a Prophet, he spoke by the mouth of all his holy prophets. As a Priest, he offered up himself for his people, the world, and ever liveth to make intercession for them. As a King, he reigns in glorious authority in his Gospel Kingdom, and will continue to reign and rule, until all are subdued (not destroyed) unto him. Christ by his prophets predicted all things relative to, and which should happen previous to his coming in the flesh. Christ in the character of a Priest defined the law, preached the gospel, and offered the sacrifice. And his own declaration, that 'the law and the prophets were until John,' prove that the prophecies had their accomplishment in his advent. *Posterior* to Christ, therefore, there was no prediction; for all the things written in the prophets, had their spiritual accomplishment in Christ; and naturally, in the *age* in which he came. Isaiah lxv. 17 to 25. is a prophecy of the new creation (regeneration) of all things in Christ. Rev. xxi. may be considered as a parallel passage, in which the subject obscurely, and prophetically described by the prophet, is more fully explained and delineated by John. The New Jerusalem described as coming down from heaven, we consider as the gospel kingdom, spoken of by Christ, *previous* to his crucifixion—and alluded to by Paul, who says, 'Jerusalem which is from above, is the mother of us all.' The first heaven, (Jewish church) and the first earth, (Jewish nation and dominion, &c.) were passed away! See Ephes. ii. 10. to the close. The Gentiles, in contradistinction to the Jews, and believers, emphatically, compose the earth, and enter the New Jerusalem Gospel church state; and the new heaven, is the kingdom which Christ spoke of in *parables*, and is Christ's mediatorial kingdom. Those who believe enter into rest, or the kingdom of heaven; or the New Jerusalem. The Old Jerusalem was distinguished by its temple: Of the New Jerusalem, John says, 'I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.' Types, and ceremonies, were once a *medium* between God and man, in the temple at the Old Jerusalem. Now, God the Father, and the Lamb, the *Mediator*, is there, and the believer receives in substance a *faith*, which was only shadowed forth in the Old Jerusalem. The gates of the temple of the Old Jerusalem were shut against all but the Jews, whose priest entered 'alone once every year, not without blood;' but the Lamb, 'by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us*.' Of the New Jerusalem, John says, 'And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day; for there shall be *no night* there.' Consequently, if there is *no night* they will not be shut at all. It may be proper to observe, that 'the *kings* of the *earth* who bring *their glory* and honour *into it*,' are disciples, or believers in Christ, who give all the glory to God. See i. 6, 'And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father.' John likewise declares, in xxi. 27. 'And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' This is the kingdom of heaven, which, said Christ, is preached unto you. And there never did, nor never will enter into it, any man who defileth the *gospel*, by saying it is conditional—or worketh abomination, and emphatically, too, by expecting his abominations will secure him an entrance—or maketh a lie, by declaring, that God is not the Saviour of all men.

The chapter containing the passage under consideration, commences thus—'And he showed me a pure river of water of life, (not death) clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God, and of the Lamb.' Reader, recollect the declaration of God—'My people have committed *two evils;* they have forsaken me the *fountain of living* water, and have hewn out to themselves, cisterns, *broken cisterns*, which can hold *no water*.' All the Arminians from the creation of the world, to this day, have been employed in fruitless attempts to hew out to themselves a *cistern* which would *hold* water, (salvation) and have never been able to produce any thing but a *broken* (leaky) *cistern*, which would hold no *water!* And Calvinists, who have declared that God has cast off for ever those who have *forsaken* him, have *made a lie*, (which has secluded them from the city) for God has declared, 'I hate putting away—How can I give thee up?' This *water* of salvation comes from the throne of God and the Lamb, not from the *broken cistern* which man *hews* out! 'In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, the tree of life.' In this new Jerusalem, is the *river* of salvation, (not a *little* brook) this river is in the *midst* of the *street*, (every one in the city knows where the *river is*—he knows this without asking—he does not say, he has a *good hope* that he *knows*'—nay, more, it is proof, that he who cannot find the *river*, knows nothing about the city!) and on both sides of the river is the *tree* of *life*. Here is no death! All mankind died in consequence of eating of the forbidden tree---here is the *tree* of *life*---and John says, 'Which bare *twelve fruits*, (not twelve *manner* of fruits. There is one kind of fruit superior to all others, and this tree bears it---namely---*truth!*) and yielded her fruit every month." We think the *twelve apostles* are prefigured here. And so long as this tree bears monthly, there will be no danger of a want of promulgators of the truth. 'And the *leaves* of the *tree* were for the *healing* of the *nations*.' We think there is a great propriety in considering this tree Christ. And we feel more than justified, in so doing; when it is considered, that its very *leaves* possessed medicinal powers sufficient to *heal nations!* The fountain from which this *river* of salvation issued, *overflowed* when Christ came in the flesh, and saved a guilty world! It may be considered, figuratively, as running between *two dispensations*, the law and gospel; and Christ, the *tree*, being on either side of it, and the river of salvation in the midst, is illustrative of the universal goodness of God, who has broken down the middle wall of partition, and of Jew and Gentile made one body on the tree! 'And there shall be no more curse; but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him.' It is worthy of notice, that the *curse* is put in opposition and contradistinction to the *throne* of God, &c. To *curse*, is to *reject*. To be cursed, therefore, is to be rejected. There is no curse, or *rejecting* here. Those who prefer being *out* of the city, *making leaky cisterns*, are not cursed in the city, for they are not there---but *out* of it! His servants may be considered as serving him, emphatically, for they acknowledge no other *Master*. They bow the knee to none of the *idols* which men erect, not acknowledge the *divinity* of any of their *diplomatic puppets!* Christ is their *Prophet*, PRIEST, and *King;* and they neither want, nor will they acknowledge any other! 'And they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads.' All difficulty here will vanish, when it is recollected, that this is figurative. To see a man's *face*, is to *identify*, to *know* him. The language of the prophet, praying to God for the light of his countenance, may be considered as illustrative of this. The declaration, 'And his name shall be in their *foreheads*,' is remarkably emphatic. What is his name? Ans. SAVIOUR! Can any thing be more conspicuous, than in the *forehead?* The *true* believer in Christ has this name, and this alone in his forehead. SAVIOUR! not DESTROYER! 'And there shall be *no night* there.' Consider the figure; in the night it is *dark*, but in this *city*, there is *no* night---he, therefore, who is in the dark, is *not* in the *city!*' And they need no candle, neither light of the sun, (why?) for the Lord God giveth them light.' How many are in pursuit of candles and suns in our day, not to light them into the city, but to enable them to finish *hewing* their *broken cisterns?* Do we tell them 'the Lord *giveth* us light.' We receive for answer, *Hew your cistern*, make it *tight*, or you will have no light! You must earn it! Thus the blind are leaders of the blind, and they both fall into the ditch. 'And they shall reign for ever and ever.' We have no inclination to press this hyperbole into our service. We shall reign, and believers after us, until God shall be all in all, for he alone has a right to reign *in* and over all! The language however is figurative. The *believer* is represented as *reigning*, instead of darkness, doubt, and fear, reigning over *him!*' And he said unto me, These sayings *are* faithful and true. (Not doubtful, and uncertain!) And the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to show unto his servants (What? Ans.) the things which must *shortly* be done.' How long is *shortly?* Is there an honest man in possession of his senses, who would say, that the word *shortly* was figurative of a *long* term of time? We think not. Reader, nearly eighteen hundred years have passed, since these words were spoken by him who cannot *lie*, nor *deceive!* 'Behold, I come *quickly*.' Is the word *quickly* expressive of a *long* time? Mark well what follows—'Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book.' Can that man be said to *keep* the sayings of the prophecy of this book, who *perverts* or denies them? Find the man who perverts the sayings of the prophecy of this book, and says, the coming here spoken of is the future coming of Christ to judge the world by the law of Moses, and damn with never-ending wretchedness, all who have not rendered *perfect obedience unto it*, and you will find a man who is cursed with *cistern hewing*, and trembling with apprehension! There never lived the man, who *perverted* the sayings of this prophecy, in this manner, who could ever lay his hand upon his heart, and in honest sincerity, say, Come Lord Jesus, come *quickly*, (now! not 2000 years hence, now) and judge me, and damn me FOR EVER if you can find ought against me! No! Never! Reader, we put the question to *you*---to your *conscience*---Lay your hand on your heart, and answer. Is this your view of the subject. Have you *kept* the sayings of the prophecy of this book in that manner, that *you* are *blessed?* Are you ready, this moment---now---to say, Come---Lord Jesus, come *quickly*---Let the *earth rock* to her *centre*---Let the planets over my head in wild confusion, rush, planet on planet, world on world, and system on system, and the trump of God's Archangel burst the concave firmament, and rending heavens reveal in flames, thunders and fire, an incensed and terrific Judge! Are you ready to stand the test of that law, which says, thou shalt not *covet?* To meet that Judge, who will blast your soul with torments inconceivable in magnitude, and endless in duration, for *one* violation of its requirements? "*He* that offends in *one point* is guilty of ALL!!!"

'And I John saw these things, and heard.' And when I had heard, and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these

things. Then saith he unto me, See *thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the saying of this book. Worship God. And he saith unto me Seal not [make it known] the sayings of the prophecy of this book; for the *time* is at *hand*. He that is unjust (when? He that *is*, in the *present* tense, now, not *thousands* of years hence!) let him be unjust still, (How *long* does the word *still*, mean? It does not read, when I *come*, in the *future* tense, let all that *shall*, in the future tense, *be* unjust, *continue* unjust without alteration or end!) and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still.' As if he had said---The things which thou hast seen and heard, make known to the world---The time for the accomplishment of these things, is at hand---I am the Saviour. I am coming in my mediatorial kingdom to all men---things shall remain for the present, as they are---'My reward *is* with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. Blessed *are* they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.' The commandment is to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. And Paul says, 'We who have believed, *do enter into rest.*' They who believe 'have a right to the tree of life.' The man who believes 'Christ was delivered for his offences, and rose again for his justification,' knows he *has a right* to Christ; for he is the redeemed of the Lord! He enters through the *twelve* gates, the witness and testimony of the *twelve* apostles into the city. When the Jews asked Christ, saying, 'What shall we do, that we may work the work of God, Jesus said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye should believe on him whom he hath sent.' If you *believe*, it is the *work* of *God*; not your own---for *faith* is the *gift* of God. Christ has come in his kingdom. Those who *work* the work of *God*, or in other words---those who *believe*, *enter* into the city, the New Jerusalem. Those who doubt the *ability*, or *will*, of Christ to save them, independently of their own merit, are *hewing* out to themselves *cisterns*, broken cisterns, which can hold *no water!* 'For without *are* dogs, &c.' These are figurative of the various sects of unbelievers in the Unconditional, and Universal salvation of God: And they are *without*; they have not, neither can they ever enter the city in the way they are seeking; for they have not 'kept the sayings of the prophecy of this book.'

'He which testifieth these things, saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.'

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER.

In our last, we noticed a *letter* published in this work, written by J. R. who *pretended* he had once been a Universalist preacher, &c. This letter contained a quotation from 'Scott's Force of Truth,' as follows---'By *experience* I am well acquainted with *Satan's* intention, in employing so many of his servants to *invent* and propagate those pestilent *errors*, whether in speculation or practice, that have in all ages corrupted and enervated the pure and powerful doctrine of the Gospel; for they lead to forgetfulness of God, and security in sin; and are deadly poison to every soul that imbibes them, unless a miracle of grace prevent. The same is the tendency of all other speculations of *reasoning* men, which set God's attributes at *variance* with each other,'—and wonderful to relate, among other things, '*explain* away all the *mysteries* of the Gospel!' In this state, Mr. Scott says he once was. And J. R. says, this was *his* state, &c *

When J. R. was a Universalist, he was well acquainted with *Satan's intention*. How was this brought about? He says, by *experience!* Reader, where shall we find terms to express the *folly* and *wickedness* of that man, who, while he was *experiencing* and knowing the *intention* of Satan, to *destroy* his soul, advocated his *cause*, and this, with his *eyes open?* This was not all—he propagated pestilent *errors*, knowing them to be such! Now we have no doubt but he propagated *error*, for he has declared what his *former* sentiments were; that they were those 'which represent the Supreme Governor, as so *weakly* merciful, that he regards neither the demands of his *justice*, the glory of his *holiness*, the *veracity* of his *word*, nor the *peaceable order* and subordination of the *universe*.' He must have been a *heretic* indeed. And even now, his *impudence* is unparalleled, (in attempting to charge his heretical errors to the account of those, who bear the name of Universalists,) except by the *falsehood* of the charge.

That this '*wolf in sheep's clothing*' may be known, and no longer have a *cloak* for his *sins*, we shall contrast his *pretended* Universal faith, with the faith of the *Gospel* of Jesus Christ, which we believe and advocate.

And *first*. Of the '*Attributes* of God.' We believe they harmonize. His Unbounded *goodness* prompted—His Infinite *wisdom* planned—and His Almighty power *executed* the *salvation of the world!* '*God is Love.*' And, 'God commendeth his love *toward us*, in *that while we were yet sinners* Christ died *for us*.' And we have his own declaration—'I am God, I *change not!*' The Scriptures likewise declare, that 'A *friend* loveth at *all times*;' and that whom 'God *loveth* he chasteneth.' That he 'will *destroy* the *wickedness* of the wicked;' and that '*All* nations whom God hath made, *shall come* and worship before him, and glorify his name!"

Of the '*Mercy* of God.' We represent Him OMNIPOTENT in *mercy!* We declare, that 'Beside *Him* there is *no Saviour*. By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that *not* of yourselves, it is the *gift* of God. *Not* of *works*, lest any man should *boast!*'

We believe he '*regards* the demands of his *Justice*.' His *justice* requires that all men should *love* and *serve* him. 'Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with *all* thy *heart*, *mind*, *soul*, and *strength*; and thy *neighbour* as *thyself*.' We believe the time is coming when *all* shall do this; and in this *love* and *obedience*, enjoy felicity and *happiness!*

'Of the *Glory* of his *Holiness*.' We believe 'Christ of God is made unto us *sanctification*.' That the time is coming, when we who have 'borne the *image* of the *earthly*, we shall also bear the image of the *heavenly*; for this *corruptible* MUST put on *incorruption*, and this *mortal must* put on immortality.' For 'Be it known unto you, that the Head of *every man* is Christ; and the Head of Christ is God. We are *members* of his *body*, of his flesh, and of his bones.' Therefore, God hath said—'Behold, I have refined thee, but not with *silver*; [not with contributions for missionaries.] I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction. [See Romans viii. 18 to 23.] For mine own sake, will I do it: For *how should My name be polluted?* And I will not give My glory unto another.'

'Of the *veracity* of his *Word*.' He has '*Sworn* by himself, that in Christ *all* the families of the earth should be *blessed*. Unto him every *knee* shall *bow*, every *tongue* shall *swear;* Surely shall say, *In the Lord have I righteousness and strength.*' We likewise believe, that his word is pledged, and 'will not return unto him void'—that Christ shall have 'the Heathen *his inheritance*, [even if *no missionaries* were sent among them, and none of our clergymen, with their 3500 dollars salaries, *bled* at the *heart*, instead of the *purse*, for them,] and the *uttermost* parts of the earth his *possession*.'

Of the '*Peaceable* order and subordination of the *Universe*.' We believe Christ shall reign in his Mediatorial kingdom, [and he is the *only* Mediator between *God* and *man*. Works which at best, are but '*filthy rags*,' will never mediate,] 'until he hath *subdued* all things unto *himself*.' We believe 'The *last* enemy shall be *destroyed;* DEATH!' That 'God will *wipe* away *tears* from off *all faces*.'

Of '*Satan*'. We believe "Christ was manifested that he might *destroy* death, and him that had the power of death, that is the *devil*; and deliver *them*, who *all* their life time were subject to *bondage*.'

Of the '*Mystery* of the *Gospel*'. We believe the mystery of the gospel, and God be praised, we understand it too, and of all men, are the *last* who would explain it *away*. See, *Here it is*, 'Having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to his *good pleasure*, which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, *He* might gather together in one, (reader, mark well the words—*He*, God might gather. Not *men*. Not missionaries, and missionary societies) ALL THINGS in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, *even* in him.' And the '*veracity* of God's word' has been pledged again, and again; and he has declared, 'My word is gone forth, and shall not return unto me *void*.—And that *Word* inspired the apostle Peter, to say of 'Christ, whom the heaven must receive [retain] until the *restitution of all things*, which God [not man] hath spoken by the mouth of *all his* holy prophets since the world began.' Universal restitution, or salvation, therefore, is of all doctrines the *oldest!* And all who do not testify, or *speak* of it, are *unholy* prophets; and are *not* God's prophets! And if the 'heaven *receives* Christ, until the *restitution* of *all* things,' then the declaration, that *when* Christ comes, he will *damn* with endless wretchedness a *part* of mankind, is a *lie;* and proceeded from the '*devil*, who is a liar from the beginning!' We, now, triumphantly ask, Is *our faith*, which is founded on the *veracity* of the word of God, and which 'God (himself) hath spoken by the mouth of all his *holy prophets* since the world began'—Is *this* faith a '*pestilent error*,' and an *invention* of the *devil*, and were all God's *holy* prophets his *servants?* Answer in the affirmative, at your PERIL!!!

* J. R. was a *Deist* by his own confession; for he acknowledges he *rejected* the *Saviour*.

Communication.

PARABLE OF THE SHEEP AND GOATS.

An Exposition of Matt. XXV. 31 to 46 *inclusive; by showing its connexion and analogy with other parts of the sacred writings, and their application to this parable proved, and established, &c.*

'When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.' verse 31. This verse predicted the Lord's second coming. These words were spoken while he was in the flesh; and under the dispensation of his first appearance in this world, when God was manifest in the flesh. It was at this time, that the mighty power of God was witnessed, healing all manner of diseases, &c. All that time Christ was *under the law*, (John, vii. 39.) and continued so, until he burst the bars of death, and triumphed over the grave. See Gal. iv. 4. Heb. x. 12. "He appeared once in the *end* of the *world*, (or legal dispensation, to *put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself. Heb. ix. 26. 1 Cor. x. 11. At his *first* appearance, in the *flesh*, he foretold his *second* coming in the *Spirit;* declaring that the kingdom of God was at hand, when he would appear 'upon the throne of his glory.' [Isaiah lx. 7, 8.] That is, in the covenant of *grace* and mercy to the soul; as prefigured in *healing* the *flesh* at his first coming. See concerning the *second* glory, Heb. ix. 27, 28. 2 Cor ii. 7 to 11, and 15 to 18. By Christ coming with his mighty angels, we understand his appearing in the ministry of reconciliation. See 2 Cor. v. 18 to 21. Matt. ix. 37, 38. xiii. 39. As the word *angel* properly signifies *messenger*, (2 Cor. viii. 23.) every true and faithful minister of the gospel is signified by 'all his *holy angels*.' They are sent to introduce their Divine Master to the world. Paul says he was received as an *angel* of God. And we read of the seven angels [in Rev.] that John was commanded to write to. 'When the Son of man shall come in his glory,' &c. Quere. Do these words naturally imply a scene in this, or another state of existence? Ans. They literally purport that the exhibition was to be on this side the grave; for Christ was to *come*, &c. [see John xiv. 18, 19, 20.] not men to *go*.

I will now give farther proof from the Scriptures. See Matt. xvi. 27, 28. 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his work. [Mark what follows,] Verily, I say unto you, there be some *standing here* which shall *not*

taste of *death*, till *they see* the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' See John xxi. 22. Matt. x. 23. These passages prove the truth of my answer to the above quere. The parable in Matt. xxv. is a continuation of the subject treated of in the xxiv. In this chapter our Lord gives his disciples a very sublime description of his second coming; and connects the destruction of Jerusalem with that event. Much figurative language is used by him in the description. Such as *eagles* being gathered to the *carcass*. The sun being darkened, &c. The Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, &c. In the 34th verse, he says, 'Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.' Mark and Luke have noticed and recorded the same. See Mark xiii. 30. Luke xxi. 32.

I have not leisure to enter upon the subject minutely, suffice it to say, the time of the destruction of the worldly sanctuary at Jerusalem, was the identical period when the Son of man should come in his glory. Then he appeared glorious in the fulfilment of his prophecies. See Matt. xxiv. 2. Luke xix. 41 to 44. 'And before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them [the *nations*,] *one* from another, [not *angelic* nature from human *nature*] as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on the *right* hand, but the goats on the *left*.' Mark well, reader, that if *sheep* and *men*, or nations, on the right hand, are *convertible* terms, then *goats* and *men*, on the left hand, *must* be convertible terms also; as the division is that of one *people* from another. And to *another*, reader, I would observe, Be careful that you do not call that an *individual* division, which our Lord so plainly represents to be the dividing of one *nation* from another *nation*. Observe well, and answer—Quere. What is meant by this *division* of one nation [people] from another? Ans. Jew and Gentile are brought into view. The Gentiles [believers] are represented under the similitude of *sheep;* which signifies, that they are subjects of the gospel call. 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit [possess] the kingdom,' &c. Being on the *right* hand, signifies *favour*. Quere. Why are they called *righteous*? Ans. Because they were *not transgressors of the law* given to Israel, as they were never *under* that law. [See Rom. iv. 15.] Second. Because *original sin* was cancelled in Christ. See Rom. ix. 30.* 'The Gentiles which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith.' Compare this with Gal. iii. 8. and you will find the Gentiles are distinctly blessed. What kingdom is that, which the Gentiles are called into? Ans. The kingdom given to Christ; which is the kingdom of God's conquering grace; but not the final kingdom [heaven] of endless felicity. See Luke xxii. 29, 30. compared with 1 Cor. xv. 24 to 28. This conquering kingdom of grace, is the same which our Lord told the unbelieving Jews should be taken from them, and given to a nation (Gentiles) bringing forth the fruits thereof. Matt. xxi. 43. Luke xvii. 20, 21. This kingdom will remain peculiarly among the Gentiles, until all the Gentiles are called in, 'and then all Israel shall be saved.' Rom. xi. 25 to 27. In this kingdom is the life of the gospel, called *everlasting life*, because it is constantly swallowing up death in victory; and will continue so, until the 'last enemy, death, is destroyed:' and then this (*aionion*) life of the gospel, itself, will be swallowed up of immortality! This is the *life* brought to light by the gospel, when 'God shall be all in all.' See 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10. Ephes. i. 13, 14.

Quere. What is meant by all nations being gathered before the Son of man? Ans. This relates to the complete plan of salvation in Christ; as a full and sure salvation was wrought out *in* and *by* him for all, both Jews and Gentiles. See Ephes. ii. 15, 16. iii. 6, 7. Therefore, all are represented as gathered before him. Quere. Why are they in the next place separated, the Jews from the Gentiles? Ans. This relates, first, to the division of the law and Gospel: that is, to those, to whom the law was given, in contradistinction to those, to whom the law was not given. The former rejected the gospel, and sought justification by the deeds of the law; the latter knew not the law given to Israel. Second. It related to those who were first to come into the knowledge of the truth of man's salvation, in contradistinction to those who were to be last in that knowledge; for although the Jews were *first* in the knowledge of the *law*, or *first covenant*, yet they are *last* in the knowledge of the *gospel*. See Mark x. 31.

In the 41st verse of the parable, the voice of the Shepherd to those on the *left* hand, is, 'Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, *prepared* for the *devil* and *his* angels.' Have we any evidence from the scripture of any of the human family being cursed of God? Ans. He does not say, Depart from me ye cursed of my Father; but, 'Depart ye cursed.' The Scriptures inform, that some are cursed, and that many are under the curse; and the same Scriptures prove, that the God of love never cursed any of his creatures. I shall prove this. Paul in his Epistle to the Gal. i. 8, 9. says, 'But though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, *let* him *be* accursed. As we said before, so say I now again; If any man preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed.' Did not the Jews preach another gospel, than that preached by the apostles? They did. They taught, and still teach, a Messiah yet to come; and denied Jesus, who had come. They are, therefore, cursed children. Hence Peter in his 2d Epis. ii. 14, 15. speaking of those who have hearts of covetousness, and had forsaken the right way, calls them 'cursed children.' This was truly applicable to all who forsook Christ, the true and living way, and turned to Judaism, in bondage under the law, which worketh wrath; therefore under the *curse*. 'For as many as are of the *works* of the *law*, are under the *curse;* for it is written---Cursed is every one (that is under the law,) that *continueth* not in *all* things which are *written* in the book of the law to *do them*.' The Jews are of the works of the law, and yet do not obey the law; *they* therefore, are cursed. See John vii. 19. I will quote one passage more, proving those cursed, (rejected,) who reject the Lord Jesus Christ at his *second* coming. 1 Cor xvi. 22. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema, Maran---atha." Which is, let him be accursed (rejected) in the coming of the Lord Jesus. This Epistle was written some time *before* the destruction of Jerusalem; the apostle alluded to that event and coming of Christ, when judgment would be executed on the rebellious Israelites. See Luke xix. 27. Christ does not curse them; the *law*, on which they trusted, *curses* them; and Christ designates them as *voluntarily* under and choosing a *law*, which *condemns* them, in preference to a *Saviour*, and *his gospel*, which *gives life*. Christ, therefore, addresses them by their proper name and character! Their being on the *left* hand, denotes their rejection and disgrace This the Jews experienced, when their magnificent Temple and City were destroyed, their priesthood abolished, and their nobles slain. See Luke xix. 27.

What are we to understand by the 'fire prepared for the devil and his angels?' Undoubtedly the *burning Sinai* in the giving of the law, and brought into view; that as the Israelites were then filled with fear, horror, and dismay, in the *giving* of the law, even so, when tried by that law, in the close of the law dispensation, a fiery anguish would seize their guilty souls. And the sight of their burning city, (Matt. xxii. 7.) and destruction of their Temple, the sanctuary of their God, wherein atonement was made once every year by the high priest for the sins of the people, this being the literal fulfilment of the prophecies of him, whom they had *rejected*, must have filled their minds with anguish inexpressible. They had treasured up wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgments of God, by rejecting the counsel of God against themselves.

What is meant by the '*devil and his angels?*' The fire, it appears was prepared for them. I will readily admit that *goat* and *devil* are convertible terms in the parable. So also are *angels* and *goats*. But it will not of necessity follow that the devil and his angels included all that were represented by the goats, any more, than the High Priest, and chief priests, included the whole Jewish Church; they were all *Jews*, but not all *priests*. Why were the Jews represented under the similitude of *goats*? Ans. This is agreeable to the figure discovered in the (goat) child *Esau;* who was a *figure* of God's *first* covenant *people*. Esau was the first born, to whom according to the ancient usage, pertained the inheritance, or patrimony, and the father's blessing, but he despised, and sold his birth-right to Jacob, who was a figure of the (Gentiles) *second* covenant people. Heb. xii. 16 to 19. Even so Christ, when he came to his own (the nation of the Jews,) they despised him, (the blessing,) and delivered him to the Gentiles. Now, therefore, the children of the kingdom are cast out. Luke xiii. 28, 29. But Esau, as well as Jacob, was *blessed*, concerning things to come. See Heb. xi. 20. And all Israel shall be blessed at last, when the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in. For the *first* shall be *last*, and the *last* shall be *first!* See Luke xiii. 30.

Why were the officers in the Jewish Church, characterized as the devil and his angels? Ans. Because they were adversaries to Christ and his apostles. The word *adversary* and *devil* being convertible terms in the New Testament, and signifying the same thing. See 1 Peter, v. 8. Luke, xxi. 15. I think the High Priest is signified by the devil, mentioned in John, viii. 41. 44. Ye do the deeds of your father, &c. 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him; when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it.* See 55 v. my reasons are as follow. First, these words were spoken to the Jews; and the High Priest was considered as the father of the Jewish Church. Second. The deeds of the law recommended *by their father*, they chose, rather than to come to Christ for life. Third. The lust of their father, implies an *incarnate* being; (See John viii. 15.) and will apply to a *man*, but not to a *spirit*. Fourth. The High Priest was a murderer from the beginning of the Messiah's making his appearance in the world, watching his steps with an evil eye, and murderous heart, and bent on his destruction.—Fifth. He was the father of that *lie* which taught the people that the true Messiah had not yet come. Sixth. The High Priest wished the continuation of the priesthood of Aaron; hence selfishly he spake of his own, against Christ, who came to abolish the priesthood under the law. Therefore the High Priest of the *law*, was the constant adversary to the message of the *covenant* of grace; hence devil. I believe it was this same devil, or adversary, which tempted our Lord in the wilderness.—The Jewish Church was at that time spiritually in the wilderness (see Psalm, lxxii. 9. lxxiv. 14.) as much so, as the children of Israel were formerly *forty* years wandering in the wilderness literally.—They were through unbelief, prevented from entering the promised land. All this prefigured the state the Jews were in when Christ came in the flesh. They could not enter the gospel dispensation because of their unbelief. After the Holy Spirit descended upon our Lord, he was led away

* We must dissent from Mysticus. They are not called *righteous* because they did not *violate* the law. This is *negative* at best. They would in this case, be neither *righteous*, nor *unrighteous*. Mysticus' quotation from Rom ix. 30. tells what their *righteousness* is. 'Even the *righteousness* which is of *faith*.' See Rom. iii. 9 to 24. Again, *Original* sin (in the common and universal acceptation of the term) is not done away *in-Christ* any more than *every*, and *all* other *sin*. 'For sin entered into the world, and *death* by *sin*, and so death (How?) passed upon all men, for that all have sinned! Ye are dead; and your life is hid with Christ in God.'

* We think Mysticus is clothing the Jewish High Priest, with qualifications and powers that did not altogether belong to, and was not possessed by him. Quere. Who was the *father* of the *lie* told to *Eve?* Peter, (see 2 Epis. ii. 4.) wrote his Epistle *prior* to the destruction of Jerusalem; or the fulfilment of Matt. xxv. 41. Again, if there is a distinction made between the *generation*, on whom Christ said *all* these things should *come*, and the *priests* of the Jewish church, we think *they* have no part nor lot in the matter.

into the wilderness by the spirit, where he was tempted. I conclude he was led by the Spirit of God, to examine the situation of the lost sheep of the house of Israel. At this time he fell in with the adversary, the High Priest, who wishing to know certainly, whether he was the Christ, or not, said unto him, 'Command that these stones be made bread.' Wishing for a convincing sign or miracle. Our Lord, to show that his mission was not of an earthly nature, but spiritual, replied, 'It is written, man shall not live by bread alone; but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' Matt. iv. 3. 4. The adversary then took him to Jerusalem, into the bosom of his Church, that is into the *temple;* represented by the figure of going into an high mountain, Luke iv. 5. Let it be remembered, that the house of Israel, God's ancient covenant people, were called 'the mountain of the Lord's house;' (Isaiah, ii. 2, 3. compared with Dan. ii. 44, 45,) implying that superior rank of elevation in point of privilege, which they held among the nations of the earth. Here it was the Jewish High Priest, our Lord's adversary, the man of sin, exalted and opposed himself to God; showing himself as God, and sitting in the temple of God. 2 Thess. ii. 3 to 8. In this temple at Jerusalem the adversary boasted to our Lord, of his right to give dominion to whomsoever he would, over all the kingdoms of the world. There he offered to make (or anoint) Christ king over all, if he would fall down on his knees before him; signified by the words, '*worship me.*' But our Lord replied, 'Get thee behind me, Satan. For it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve' Heb i. 6. As this command was *in* the *law* of Moses, given to Israel, the High Priest was amenable to it; and it was pre-eminently binding on the Priesthood of Aaron. Therefore to the adversary, the High Priest, it was peculiarly applicable. Hence the propriety of the rebuke; to him, who instead of kneeling to Immanuel, God with us, had demanded the reverse.

It may be objected, if the tempter in this case was a mere *man*, why was he called *Satan?* Ans. For the same reason our Lord called Peter Satan. Matt. xvi. 23. 'He turned, and said unto Peter, get thee behind me *Satan*, thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.' Reader, the reason is here given why Peter was called Satan. It was not because he favoured the things of a fallen angel in nature, but the things of fallen man. For the same reason the tempter was called Satan.* The High Priest next attempts to unite civil and ecclesiastical government. See John vi. 15. He offers our Lord a seat in the temple at Jerusalem; represented by the figure of his setting him on a pinnacle of the temple; and next, that our Lord should submit to the former proposal, recorded as follows, 'Cast thyself down from thence, for it is written, He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up' [Or exalt thee.] Here the adversary endeavours to prove by scripture that the officers in the *Jewish church* had a particular charge over Christ, to bear him up; that is, to set him over all kingdoms, and to bear rule in the temple at Jerusalem likewise.† But to this argument our Lord replies---'It is said thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' Luke iv. 9 to 13. 'When the devil had ended all his temptation, he departed from him for a season.' Perhaps for about one year; or until the time when Christ was brought by an armed force before the High Priest, when he was again insulted by that old adversary. I think Br. B. must be wrong, if he concludes that any thing in Christ was the tempter; call it what he may; *will* of the *flesh, carnal mind, or earthly nature.* For the tempter left him for a season, which supposes a real personality; we cannot suppose the earthly nature was separated from him until his resurrection from the dead.

I believe that during the time of our Lord's being tempted at Jerusalem the dispute between *Michael* and the *devil* about the *body* of *Moses* was carried on; as mentioned in Jude 9thverse. By the body of Moses, [See John ix. 28. Heb. ix. 19.] I understand the *law covenant,* (see Heb. vii. 18, 19.) in which Moses was the mediator, see Gal. iii. 19. I think the nature of the dispute must be this;---one party contended for the annulling of the *law covenant,* and the abolishing of the *legal Priesthood,* and the other, for its *continuance.* And as Christ was then under the law, he brought no railing accusation against his antagonist, but said, 'The Lord rebuke thee Satan.' Because it is written, 'Thou shalt not speak evil of the Ruler of thy people.' Acts xxiii. 5. The High Priest ruled in the synagogue of Satan; called so, in Rev. iii. 9. Because under the direction of the grand adversary of Christ and his gospel. That Christ is meant by Michael, we have an evidence in Dan. xii. 1. 'And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time. And at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. (Or enrolled in the gospel service.) Compare this with Matt. xxiv. 21, 22, 30, 34. and you will see that this prophecy refers to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; when Michael, [the Son of man] delivered his followers from the persecutions of the Chief Priest.

This was the closing scene of that *war in heaven,* spoken of in Rev. xii 8, 9, 10. This war is expressed in sublime and figurative language. And relates to the contest between Christianity and Judaism; carried on, on the one part, by *Christ,* and his *apostles,* in the language of prophecy, *Michael* and his *angels.* And on the other, the *High Priests,* and his *chief-priests;* figuratively called the *dragon* and his *angels,* signifying the destroyer and his emissaries, that old Serpent, deceiver, the devil, adversary, Satan. He and his angels prevailed not, but were cast out of heaven. Which signifies the fall of the Jewish Priesthood from the elevated station in which they had been placed. The joy of the followers of the Lamb in being delivered from this persecution, is represented by loud voices in heaven, saying, 'Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ; for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them day and night before our God.' The High Priest had been constantly officious in accusing the apostles, both to the Roman Governors, as seditious persons, and to the Jews, as opposers of Moses. He walked about as a roaring lion in the wilderness of the Jewish church, seeking whom he might devour. Therefore, Peter cautions his brethren to give no occasion to the common adversary, as follows---'Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour.' 1 Peter v. 8. The objector perhaps will say, it is presuming too much to apply the term devil, to a mere man. But let it be remembered, that our Divine Master called Judas a devil, John vi. 70, 71. And wherefore? Was it not because he made a covenant with devils, when he covenanted with the *chief priests* to betray his Lord, for thirty pieces of silver? But it may be objected---That devil you call High Priest, is sometimes called that old Serpent, &c. in scripture; will this apply to the High Priest? Ans. I think it will. For I remember our Lord called the Scribes and Pharisees, Serpents and Vipers. If he called the followers of the High Priest Serpents, may not their *leader* be termed the old Serpent? I acknowledge that the terms devil, Satan, and devils, are not always in all cases in the New Testament applied to real persons. Sometimes the spirit of the world is meant—the will of the flesh—evil propensities—diseases, &c. The nature of the subject will generally determine this point, so that if we are careful we need not be led astray.

I shall close with a few more remarks on the parable of the *sheep and goats.* It is obvious that this parable has no reference to a *future* or *last* day of judgment, according to the common understanding of the term; but to what may be termed the *midnight* judgment. See in the same chapter, the parable of the *ten virgins.* As *midnight* is the *ideal* line of division, between *two* days, in this sense, the term is used in this parable, to mark the *change* from one *dispensation* to another; by the destruction of the worldly sanctuary and priesthood, so that the dragon and his angels should find no more place in heaven, their temple being destroyed, the High Priest and his under priests could no more find a place in Jerusalem to perform the rites appertaining to their office. Matt. xxiv. 1, 2. No temple there for ever. Heb. vii. 12. This change in the order of worship, fulfilled the words of the Lord, spoken to the woman of Samaria. John iv. 21 to 24. 'Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father, &c. God is a Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit, and in truth.' Although the *sun* of the *legal,* or *Mosaic* dispensation was *set,* when Christ on the cross, said '*It is finished,*' yet figuratively, the *evening* of that day lasted until *midnight;* or in other words, until the fulfilment of the parable of the *sheep* and *goats.*

Dear reader, I sincerely pray, that you may receive this testimony, divested of prejudice, as from a sincere friend, and lover of the Lord Jesus.

MYSTICUS.

* We take the liberty to remark, that Peter *was* a *devil,* or he was *not* a *devil.* If Peter was not a devil, but was called Satan because he *savoured* the things of *men,* is it to be inferred then, that men are devils? If so, *Peter* was a devil, for Peter was a man; If Peter therefore, was not a devil, then men are not devils! The *High Priest,* therefore, is not a devil. Christ came in the *end* of the *aionos*;—the devil was [a liar] from the beginning!

† It is our opinion, that the phraseology of the passage alluded to, will not admit of this construction. We think the devil was a *poor commentator.* Now *tempting and deceiving* are two things. It would have been gross deception for the devil to have palmed himself upon Christ as an *angel* of God; especially at the moment he was exposing his *ignorance* by a misapplication of the Scriptures! The devil *tempted or tried* Christ, by his great offers. Relative to the passage quoted by the devil, we observe—the language is figurative of the security of believers in Christ. And had not the devil introduced the *misapplication,* we think it would not have been thus *perverted!* At all events, we must have better authority than the *devil* before we believe it! He who commanded the dead to come forth, and was obeyed, wanted the assistance of no angels'

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

If God intended that the salvation of the souls of men should be *effected* by *their* obedience *in this life,* will not his plan be *accomplished,* and men be saved? If men are not obedient in this life, is it not incontestable evidence, that God *never* designed they should be *saved* by *this* means? What do you think of this, reader? Can you seriously say, that God's design will be *frustrated* by the *feeble* efforts of impotent man? No, you cannot! Omnipotence will do all his pleasure. Whatever may be the design of God, it *must* be accomplished! For *Infinite* wisdom *planned—Unbounded* goodness *prompted*—and *Almighty* power will *execute.* Therefore, the final issue will be *good!* Good, far beyond the feeble powers of mortals to *describe,* or even to *conceive!* For 'God is Love,' and 'Love thinketh no ill.'

What do you think? If God designed that Christ should 'make peace through the blood of *his* Cross, *by him* to reconcile *all* things unto himself, and is *in Christ* reconciling the *world* (not a part, or the elect only,) unto himself, *not* imputing *their* trespasses unto *them,*' will it not be *accomplished?* What do *you* think? Could unbounded goodness desire *less*—Cannot Infinite wisdom *mature,* and Almighty power *execute* this reconciliation? It can! It will! Reader, but *one* thing is *lacking!* your *assent!* your *belief!* And this shall be given; for JEHOVAH has 'sworn by himself; His word has gone forth, and shall not return unto him void; that unto him, *every knee* shall bow, *every tongue* shall swear; *Surely* shall say, *In* the Lord *have* I *righteousness* and strength, and *all* that are incensed against him shall be *ashamed!*' Reader, what do *you* think? Will *every* tongue swear to the *truth?* Is not the righteousness of *God* sufficient? or will God be defeated, for want of '*filthy rags,*' the righteousness of the *creature?* *What do you think?*

Correspondents will be noticed in our next.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, 1821. NO. 38.

AN EXPOSITION OF LUKE XVI.

(*Continued from page* 114.)

PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

"And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried."

The parables of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, however *diversified* by the figures in which he related them, had for their object the accomplishment of the prophecies, and the introduction and glory of his Mediatorial kingdom. There is, however, a difference in the *order* in which these parables are recorded by the Evangelists. Matt. xxv. appears to be the conclusion of the great events mentioned in, and of the parables themselves. The difference in the order and arrangement is there manifest, when compared with the gospel by Luke. Matthew is more *particular in his* relation. Luke xix. 12 to 26. relates the same parable, which is contained in Matt. xxv. 14 to 30. And Luke xxi. and Matt. xxiv. may be considered as parallel passages, and unanswerable evidence of Christ's *coming* in his kingdom, &c., during the *then* generation. The parable under discussion, although different in *figure*, is in substance the same, as that related by Matt. xxv. from 31 to 46 inclusive. Both relating to the *casting* off of the Jews, and *receiving* of the Gentiles, &c.

'*And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom.*' It is common to a proverb to consider *death* as a release from *bodily suffering*; and there are few who have arrived to mature years, who have not experienced a kind of melancholy satisfaction, on witnessing the decease of those, whose bodily infirmities and pains had been of long duration. This *figure* is therefore peculiarly emphatic, and illustrative of the *poor beggar*. His situation was distressing indeed; and not susceptible of any amelioration. It was too calamitous to be improved by any change of circumstances. This was the condition of the *Gentile world!* The *angels* in the parable, are figurative of the *apostles*, who were the messengers of good news. '*Abraham's bosom*,'—the *faith* of Abraham. The *bosom* is figuratively the receptacle of all that is useful in knowledge, or consolatory in religion. *And* is described under the figure of a *chest*, in which are contained the *heart*, the seat of the *affections*, the abode of *faith* and *love*; and the *life* of the creature; and may be considered, when used in figure, as expressive beyond comparison. We believe in all ages it has been considered, that the receiving a person to the *bosom* of another, has conveyed the idea of the person so received, being a *partner* in all the *blessings* possessed by the *other*. In this sense, the *apostles* of Christ *carried* the *Gentiles* to Abraham's *bosom*, which was the residence of *faith*. Of that faith which came from God, faith in the promise of God, that in Christ, 'All the families of the earth should be blessed.' Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, iv. speaking of Abraham, says, 'For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, *was* not to Abraham, or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of *faith*, &c. As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations.' Paul likewise declared, '*We* who have *believed*, do enter into *rest!*' Those who have been accustomed to consider this parable a *literal* narrative, will see the absurdity at once, if they will recur to the words of Christ, who says, 'I go to *prepare* a *place* for you, &c.' Believing it cannot reasonably be objected to, we shall consider Matt. xxv. 31. to the end, as containing and relating to the same events with the parable under consideration. The *blessed* are there invited to enter the 'kingdom prepared for them *from* the foundation of the world.' But the *future* residence of the soul is not *this kingdom*, or Abraham's *bosom*, but the place which Christ has gone to '*prepare* for them!' Christ is emphatically the *only* Mediator between *God* and *man*. The *end* of his mediation is the reconciling *man* to God; not *God* to man. God never *was*, nor never will *be*, in a state of *unreconciliation* to his creature and offspring, man; if he ever was, he would necessarily remain so without end; for he is *unchangeable!* His nature is the same—to-day, yesterday, and for ever—'*God is Love!*' Paul says, 'Ye are *dead*, and your *life* is *hid* with Christ *in* God.' This *life*, therefore, mentioned by the apostle, is the *place* Christ went to *prepare* for mankind. With this view of the subject, we think the words of the prophet are beautifully sublime and appropriate. 'Lord, thou hast been our *dwelling place* in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, *thou God!*'* Psalm xc. We cannot forbear expatiating upon the glorious truth taught here. And we cannot but hope, the reader will pardon the digression. Is there a man so blinded by his prejudices, as to deny this truth, that 'God is the *Father* of the *spirits of all flesh?*' It would seem impossible there should be! How, then, can it be possible, for the *souls* of millions to be *miserable* without end, when God their Father *has* been, and *will* be, their dwelling *place? From* everlasting (referring to a period before the creation of the earth, or this world, and) *to* everlasting; and the prophet, for the *truth* of this, making this solemn appeal—'*Thou God!*' The prophet adds, 'Thou *turnest* man to *destruction;* and sayest, RETURN, ye children of *men!*' Mark the distinction—God is the *Father* of the *soul*, and the *soul*, therefore, is the *child* of *God!* The children of *men* are turned to destruction, *not* the (soul) *children* of *God!* But the (body, the) children of *men* shall *return* from destruction! Who will deny this? Cannot He who spoke worlds into being? Cannot that *Voice* which *thundered* through *Chaos*, and said,—'Let there be light—and there was light?' Cannot He *reanimate* that frame which was produced by powers delegated from his own Omnipotence? *He can! He will!* 'Praise waiteth for thee, O God, in Zion; and *unto thee* shall the vow be performed. O thou, that hearest prayer, *unto thee shall all flesh come.* Iniquities prevail against me---*our* transgressions, *thou shalt purge them away.*' Psalm lxv. *It is done!* By whom? Christ! Who, 'when he had by himself *purged our sins*, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.' Heb. i. 3.

Abraham's bosom, therefore, is not the *future* residence of the *soul;* but is figurative of the *faith* of believers in this life.

'*The rich man also died, and was buried.*' We have seen that the *beggar* by *dying* was freed from the miseries inseparable to the *state* he was in. The *rich man dies*, and instead of being carried to the *faith* of Abraham, he is *buried!* Mark well the *figure* used. He is *buried*. The *one* dies to all his *miseries*, and is carried to enjoyment; to faith *in* Christ---the faith *of Abraham!* The *other* dies to his *hopes*, to his actual enjoyments, and is buried. He is in *darkness*. There is a grave for his hopes. The *poor beggar* died, but was *not* buried. The *rich* man dies, and *is* buried.

'*And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments.*' The reader is requested to turn to Isaiah v. and vi. The *Israelites* (the rich man,) are there prefigured by a *vineyard*. God declares that he will *lay it waste*. 'Therefore, *hell* hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure; and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth, (the rich man) shall descend into it, &c.' The judgments which shall be visited upon the Israelites are enumerated—their *darkness* and *unbelief* is predicted. 'And he said, go, and tell this people, hear ye, indeed, but understand not; and see ye, indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed. Then said I, Lord, how long? And he answered, *Until* the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate, and the Lord have removed men far away, and *there be* a great forsaking in the midst of the land.' Mark the phraseology---*They descended into* HELL! The question is asked---'Lord, how long?' The answer is given. The time is *limited!* If any person should object to the word *hell* being used in a figurative sense, as a place, or rather a *state* of *darkness*, we answer, The prophet David declared, 'Thou hast delivered my soul from the *lowest hell!!!*' The prophet Jonah declared, 'Out of the belly of *hell* cried I, &c.' David, likewise, says, 'The pains of *hell* gat hold upon me; I found trouble and sorrow.' Then *hell* is a place, or state of '*trouble and sorrow.*' Surely if the *good* prophets went to *hell*, (and they certainly did if they told the truth) we ought not to be surprised at the *wicked* Israelites going there. And if God delivered David and Jonah from *hell*, he can deliver the *rich man* (the Israelites) from *hell!* We have heard of preachers, who declaim against '*hell redemptioners*,' as they are pleased to call them. We think they would do well to consider, whether their ill-timed *denunciations* are not *pointed* against the *God* who made them. God *redeemed* David and Jonah from *hell;* and God (and with *grateful reverence* we speak it) is the only Being who has the power to redeem from hell! The word translated *hell* in this passage, is the *hades* of the Greeks, which always means *grave*. It is not *Gehenna*—this word is derived from the Hebrew, and is synonymous with the *valley* of *Hinnom*, or the Hebrew *toph*, which is *tophet*. The God Moloch was worshipped, and children sacrificed to him, in this *valley* of *Hinnom*, or *tophet*. Some latitude has been taken in defining this word; but we believe the candid and intelligent reader will acknowledge its figurative import; and that it signifies a *state* (rather than a *place*) of *darkness* and *suffering*. It is very remarkable that the word *hades* should be used in this passage under consideration. This circumstance alone, proves incontestably this chapter to be a *parable*. If taken according to its *literal* import, we must understand the man to lift up his eyes in the *grave* [with his body] *literally* The *scene* would then *lie* in the *earth*. And we think there would be literally a great gulf fixed, or obstacle, to prevent, not only *passing*, but *seeing!* In Matt. v. 29. Christ says, 'And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into *hell*.' The word translated *hell*, is *gehenna*. Now this is allowed by all to be figurative; consequently, a *parable!* In the parable under consideration, the *figure* must be taken in connexion throughout, with the *person* intended. When a man *dies* literally, he is literally *buried*. But there never was a man *literally* buried in *gehenna!* We never hear of *burying* in gehenna; but *hades*, meaning *grave*, the figurative language in the parable is correct and proper. We shall find, therefore, that the Jews. [the rich man,] *literally* died, as respected their losing, and being deprived of their *spiritual* enjoyments, as much as a man *dies* to the things of *this* world, when his *body dies*. And were *literally* buried, as respects their being *out of sight* of their *spiritual* enjoyments and the

* Reader, how could *we* dwell *in* God, *before* we had an *existence?* Is not this an unanswerable argument, and incontestable evidence of the *pre-existence* of the *soul?*

truth, as much so, as a man is *buried* in the *earth*, and hidden from every thing relating to this world. This truth is declared figuratively; and the thing thus figuratively declared, is truth; and as truth is as much *literal* truth, as it is possible for any thing to be true literally. But then it is the *truth*, which is *true*, and the thing personated and intended, is that truth. Is there a man living in his senses, who would believe us, if we were to say, that the beggar *died*, and angels carried *him* (his dead body, for he was not *buried*) to Abraham's bosom, *literally*? And the rich man *died*, and was buried, *literally*, in the grave, (hades, the dirt—the earth—the ground,) and *literally* OPENED his eyes, &c? No! There is not a man living, in possession of one half of his reason, who could be guilty of so great an absurdity. It is time, then, to be done trifling with this parable. The truth has been denied long enough! If taken *literally*, the doctrine of *endless misery* cannot be found *in*, or supported from it. If taken *figuratively*, no other construction consistent with Scripture, or common sense, can be put upon it, than the view we have taken of it. We are, therefore, to understand the *literal* death of the body, and the *literal* interment of the body in the *grave*, as the *figure* used. And the truth taught in the *figure*, or parable, is the *literal* death of the *rich man* (the Jews) *spiritually*, being deprived of the knowledge of God, their Saviour, and *carnally* minded, which, says the apostle, is *death*. And that they are *literally* buried in *darkness* of mind, and *hardness* of heart, in which *state*, the 'things that belong to their peace are *hidden* (*buried*) from their eyes!'

(To be Continued.)

TWISTING—OR CONSISTENCY.

Our Divine Doctors contend, that it is necessary to qualify a man to become a minister, that he should previously learn the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages,—spend some years in a college---and study *divinity* a few years afterwards with some of their *knowing ones*. All this is indispensably necessary in America, where the Bible is a school book, and churches are as extensive as the population. Why all this? Ans. Because preaching is a very *nice mysterious* business! Now, look at this---In a *missionary talk* of theirs, speaking of a college they are going to establish at Serampore, in India, they say, it is for the 'purpose of *qualifying* as large a number as possible for the work of Christian *pastors*, and Christian *teachers*, or *missionaries*. It is expected that ONE *year's instruction* will, in MOST *cases*, be *sufficient* for this purpose!!!' Reader, does not this look a little like 'blowing *hot* and *cold* with the *same breath*!' How is it, that these Pagans, who are represented so *pitifully ignorant* in a missionary *sermon*, can go *through* the mill, and come out *veterans*, while the American is yet plodding in his 'horn book?' What a pity it is, that the Americans are not so *tractable*? How great the *superiority* of these *ignorant* men, over *those* born in *Christian* countries? An *ignorant* Pagan can be '*qualified* for 45 dollars!' Here *one thousand* is not sufficient! The powers of his mind are such, that Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, are altogether *superfluous*! How can this mystery be solved? Shall we charitably conclude, that our Calvinistic and Hopkinsian brethren have *translated* the Scriptures into the language of these *ignorant* Pagans, in such a *masterly* manner, that their several doctrines are *learned* almost as soon as *read*? Will this solve the difficulty? For we cannot suppose the being *born* in a country where the Scriptures were *not known*, and trained up in *ignorance* of every thing save idolatry, should make this vast difference in their favour! There is but one other way which can possibly account for this mystery; and wishing to be candid, we, as in duty bound, mention it. Reader, it is this. Our Missionary Societies are '*Seized with a noble frenzy*,' and wishing to make the cause *popular*, they in the eagerness of their '*noble*' zeal, are profuse in description of the *facility* of '*ministerial qualifications*' being procured *in India*; for according to one of their orators, who is in *full* possession of this 'noble frenzy,' they must *undertake a great deal*, to do a little! Consequently, applying this *rule*, we are taught, that where *much* is said, but *little* is meant! Still, however, we cannot avoid wondering a little, at the tractability of the 'poor ignorant Pagans!'

Controversial.

COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. EDITOR,—As you suppose that I am mistaken in asserting, that the Messiah and that Infinite God who sent him are two *separate* beings; the following reasons for my opinion are submitted to your impartial consideration; and if you can prove, that they are erroneous, you shall be entitled to my most cordial respects and sincere thanks.

As I agree with you, that there is but *one* Almighty God, the dispute to be decided between us, is, whether Jesus Christ *is* that one immutable Being, or his heavenly Father, who sent him. As I know but very little of the mode of existence of an Infinite God, and our heavenly Father has condescended to reveal in his word, his name, nature, person, and character, as the foundation of his unity, and the supreme adoration of his children, I consider myself bound to be governed in all my ideas and descriptions of him, by his own plain declarations. I have not taken my pen to contend for fables, fiction, or falsehood. But am contending for the existence of *two unequal beings;* that to know *one* as the only true God, and regard the *other* as his messenger, whom he sent, is declared by Jesus Christ to be *eternal life;* and I must accept of salvation on his terms, or be damned!

There must be two such distinct characters and beings in existence, or they would not possibly be *known*. And as my everlasting felicity depends on a proper knowledge of their respective *unities*, characters, and claims, I am under the strongest obligations to be serious and impartial, to gain proper information of them, that I might be able to render unto both their just due.

When a small boy, I was taught by my schoolmaster, that, one *added* to one doubled the number; and as I never quite forgot that rule, upon reading in my Bible, that, to Christians, there is but one God, the Father of all, and one Mediator, and messenger between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, I cannot help concluding, that those units added together make *two beings*.

They are represented in the Scriptures as professing *two* wills, and *two* understandings, and as each performing different and opposite actions; one acting as a servant and messenger, in subordination to the other, as the one Supreme God and Father of all, which demonstrated to me, that they are *two* separate and *unequal* beings, and claim a distinct regard.

The principal design of Christianity, was, to destroy the idol deities, and establish the exclusive supreme adoration of the one Almighty Father of all, among the human family. And wherever the Messiah published the unity and perfections of his heavenly Father that sent him, and he was known and worshipped as the one only living and true God of all; the devil's idolatrous kingdom was destroyed, the true religion of Christ and pure worship of Jehovah established.

The Messiah did not leave it to the wild imagination of his followers, to decide, who, or what they were to invoke as their only Sovereign God. But as expressly prohibited them from asking himself any thing, and enjoined on them to pray alone to his Father, who sent him, as the one true God, as Moses *forbid* the Jews bowing to a graven image. And for me to invoke Jesus Christ as my God, would be as much a transgression of his command, as Aaron's creating the golden calf, was a breach of the second commandment; although all the modern Aarons on earth worship the Messiah as supreme God.

Inspired prophets and apostles did not ignorantly worship, what Calvin styles 'a barbarous, insipid, profane, popish idol, and unknown God trinity.' But declare, that with one mind and with one mouth, they worship the one God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family on earth and in heaven are named; and they affirm, that of him, and to him, and through him are all things. The sacred writers they united with the meek and lowly Jesus and all true worshippers, and worshipped the Father alone, who is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth. And I conclude, it is right for me to copy their example. The Messiah is declared to be a middle person, who acted as Mediator and Advocate between man and his Sovereign Maker. The terms Christ, Messiah, Mediator, Intercessor, Messenger, &c. denotes delegated and inferior offices, and can no more be predicated of an Infinite God, than ignorance or wickedness. And for me to worship a subordinate character, the Mediator, instead, or with that Almighty Jehovah who sent him, would be idolatry.

As our heavenly Father appealed to his own works of creation, to demonstrate his unity and infinity, and to distinguish himself as the one only true God from idol deities, so the Messiah appealed to his miraculous works, to prove, that he was not Supreme God, but his messenger. And Christ prayed, that the world might *know* that God sent him, and though most clergymen in Christendom are praying quite contrary, that the world may know and worship the Messiah as their God. As the Saviour's knowledge and righteousness far exceeds the knowledge and righteousness of all Christian preachers on earth, I conclude, that Christ's prayers will be answered before their opposite petitions; and that the world will some time *know*, that the person of the Father alone, is the only true God, and that the Messiah is his messenger whom he sent, however much those truths are now opposed. Jehovah our heavenly Father, and his Servant, Jesus the Mediator, are the only two beings recorded in the Bible, whose unities and characters are immutably fixed, and declared to be free from all moral defects. And the least alteration in either of them, destroys their utility and perfection. To abandon the Messiah as my only mediator and pattern, and discard his heavenly Father, as the only true God, I should be left without any intercessor to plead on my behalf, and have no one infinite God to govern and bless me.

Sophistry may invent a number of mystical terms about a complex deity, compounded of opposite names, natures, persons, and characters, and superstition may sanction such mysticism, as preferable to the plain language of Scripture. But so long as there is any meaning or truth in the express words of the Bible, the Messiah, and that Infinite Being who sent him, will remain two distinct characters, and beings, and claim an unequal regard.

For me to contend, that, a son born of a woman, is quite as old as his father, by whom he was begotten, and the self same being—a servant, mediator, and messenger whom God sent, the one *immutable* and the Supreme Jehovah himself, would not only be giving the lie to plain Bible truth, and an insult on the human understanding, but must be ranked among the list of *impossibilities*, as certain, as it is impossible for our heavenly Father to lie, when he declares, I am God and change not, and besides me there is no God nor any like me.

Were I to undertake to exchange the nature, person, and the station of Jehovah and his Messenger, the Mediator, whom he sent, destroy their opposite unities, and compound them both into one and the same immutable character and infinite God, I should then presume to do more than my Almighty Father could accomplish; because he is without any variableness or shadow of turning. And I cannot act so vain and presumptuous as to pretend to do that which my Maker cannot perform. Thousands have been deluded and disappointed by invoking complex deities invented by men, and recanted. But no one was ever deceived, or had any cause to repent worshipping the God of Jesus, who is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth Nor never will. As our heavenly Father proved himself a prayer-hearing God to his beloved Son, and all the holy prophets; so he has promised to hear and answer the prayer of all his children, who call upon him with all their hearts. And instead of it being any disgrace for Christians, to regard their altogether lovely Master, Jesus,

as a Divine Messenger, and implicitly obey his command, and copy his example in loving, serving, worshipping, and glorifying his heavenly Father alone, as the only living and true God of all. I consider such practice as the brightest ornament of Christianity, and the glory of the Christian name. Because, by thus acting, they honour Christ, and glorify Almighty God in the highest.

And, until there is found a servant and worshipper of Jehovah, more worthy my implicit obedience and imitation than the meek and lowly Jesus; and it can be proved, that there is any deity so justly claiming my exclusive supreme adoration as his heavenly Father, I shall continue to regard them as two separate and unequal beings, and copy after one in adoring the other as my only God, as the best and most effectual means I am acquainted with, to perfect my holiness, and consummate my felicity in time and to all eternity. Amen.

EDWARD SHARMAN.

Springfield, New-Jersey.

ANSWER.

Our correspondent E. S. says, that he is 'contending for the existence of TWO *unequal* beings. That to know *one* as the only true God, and regard the *other* as *his* messenger whom *he* hath sent, is declared by Jesus Christ to be *eternal life*. And I must accept of salvation on *his* terms, or be damned.' We shall take the liberty to *deny* that Christ ever made the above declaration. We think E. S. would have done better, if he had produced the scriptures for his authority. We have no hesitation in saying, that the scriptures contain no such declaration. And further, when E. S. will prove, that God is a *distinct* being from *Christ*, and that they are *unequal* in their characters, we stand pledged to prove Christ the *greatest*, and *best* being in the universe! and the *other*, call him by what name you will, to be *inferior!* 'I Am God; and *beside* me there is *no* SAVIOUR. Look unto *Me*, and be ye *saved!*' Here is our FORTRESS; and we believe it is *impregnable*. This is the declaration of that God, 'who is *in* (and is) Christ reconciling the world unto himself.' It is true that 'there is *no other* name under heaven given among men whereby we *must* be saved but the name of *Jesus*?' It is well known that the translation of the scriptures, now in use, is the work of those, who were by profession *Trinitarians;* and believers in a *plurality* of *persons* in God; or, as they term it, the *Godhead*. These persons *they* have *made three* in number, Father---Son---and Holy Ghost. And they have in many instances so managed the translation, that they have represented God, and Christ, as spoken of *separately*, and distinctly, when the *original* would not justify them. We shall notice only a *few*, out of the *many*, which might be adduced in proof of our assertion. In Paul's 2d Epis. to Thess. i. 2. 'Grace unto you, and peace from God our Father, *and the* Lord Jesus Christ.' The words, '*and the*,' are here derived from the *conjunction* κ, 2 Cor. i. 3. is the same, &c. In 1 Cor. xv. 24. we find the word *even* substituted for '*and the*.' Let the translation in the two passages quoted conform to this, and we shall read 'Grace unto you, and peace from God our Father, *even* the Lord Jesus Christ.' We, therefore, consider the *original* to purport this, Who is *also* our Lord Jesus Christ! Our Trinitarian friends having *limited* the number of their gods to *three*, were under the necessity of using the word *even*, in 1 Cor. xv. 24. For had they translated the passage, 'to God, *and the* Father,' they would have represented the Father *distinct* from God, and would then have been in possession of *four* deities, which would have been *one* more than they are *allowed!* If it is objected, that the figure used in 1 Cor. xv. 24. of Christ's '*delivering* up the kingdom to God, *even* the Father,' necessarily implies *distinction* in being, and *subordination* in power, we answer---the construction usually put upon the 28th verse, would imply, that there *was* a time, when Christ, who *is* subordinate, was *not in* subordination! It *must* then follow, that if Christ possessed *all* power (and was not God) and was *not* in subordination to *God*, God *must* have been in subordination to *him*. (Christ!) We fearlessly hazard the declaration, that those who have been in the habit of viewing the subject in this light, and making this distinction, will have to acknowledge *their premises*, and *cannot* rid themselves of these, their necessary conclusions.

E. S. farther says, 'The Messiah did not leave it to the wild imagination of his followers to decide, *who*, or what they were to *invoke* as their only sovereign God. But as expressly *prohibited* them from asking himself any thing, and enjoined on them to pray *alone* to his *Father*, who sent him, as the only true God, as *Moses* forbade the Jews *bowing* to a graven image.' Reader, we have E. S.'s assertion for this; and that, without proof, is *good for nothing!* Let us examine this. How *express* was Moses in forbidding the worship of *idols*? Ans. 'Thou *shalt not bow* down thyself to them, nor *worship* them!' Did Christ ever expressly *forbid* any of his disciples, or others, from *worshipping him?* No! Did any ever worship *him?* Yes. Proof—Matt. xx. 20. 'Then came to *him* the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, *worshipping*, and desiring a certain thing of *him*.' viii. 2. 'A leper came and *worshipped him*, saying, Lord, if *thou* wilt *thou* canst make me *clean*.' xiv. 33. Then they that were in the ship, came and *worshipped him*.' xv. 25. 'Then came she and *worshipped him*, saying, Lord, *help me*.' After his resurrection, xxviii. 9. 'And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, (they *bowed* themselves to the earth) and *worshipped him*. Luke xxiv. 52. 'And they *worshipped him*.' John xix. 38. The blind man believed and *worshipped him*.' When Cornelius worshipped Peter, Acts x. 25. 'Peter said, Stand up, I myself am *only a man!*' When John would have *worshipped* the angel, Rev. xxii. 8, 9. the angel said, '*See thou do it not;* for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, &c. *Worship God!*' Reader, are we to infer from this, that Christ was a *creature*, to worship *whom* would be idolatry? Isaiah xlv. 22, 23. 'Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I *am* God, and *there is* none else. I have *sworn* by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth, righteousness, and shall not return, That *unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear*.' Philippians ii. 10, 11. 'At the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth. And *every tongue* should *confess* (what? That Jesus is a *creature*, to *worship* whom would be *idolatry*? No!) that Jesus Christ is *Lord*, to the *glory* of God the *Father*.' It was prophesied of Christ, that he should be called 'Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.' And the proper and extensive definition of Κυριος, translated Lord, is *Chief—Sovereign—Excellent*—an *Enlarger*—a *Father—Founder—Commander—Author*, &c. God has declared his glory he will not give to another. Christ, therefore, is *not* another; and the Scriptures are consistent and true, when they declare, that '*God is in Christ*.' The unity (oneness) of Father and Son, is declared by Christ, John v. 19. 'Verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.' On this one passage, which a *superficial* reader might bring as an objection to the truth we advocate, we are quite willing to rest the question. Supposing our correspondent, E. S. was to declare, 'I can do nothing of myself, but what *I see God do;* for *whatever* things he (God) *doeth*, these also *I do*. Would there be any truth in the declaration? No! None! The question naturally occurs, *What* has the Son seen the Father do? Christ answers this question; see v. 20. 'For the Father loveth the Son, and *showeth him all things that himself doeth*.' The reader is requested to notice carefully our recapitulation. Christ first declares, 'The Son can do nothing of himself.' Why, we ask? We appeal to the reader. Could not Christ do something of *himself*, if he were a being *distinct* from the Father? Christ assigns the reason why. 'What things soever he (the Father) doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.' Is it possible to put words together, or find language, which will express unity of *being*, *character*, and *action*, more emphatically than these words of Christ have done? If it is possible, we think they must be here, see 21st verse; 'For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth; *even so* [How? Even so—precisely as the Father does] the Son quickeneth whom he will.' Reader, mark well the *unity* of *being*, of *purpose*, and of *action*. As the Father quickeneth, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. We now ask, Are there *two* wills? Christ has answered the question. 'For what things soever he (the Father) doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise!' Christ continues, see verse 22. 'For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed (God is *in* Christ) all judgment unto the Son.' Why? What for? Ans. verse 23; 'That all should *honour the Son*, (How much?) even as they honour the Father. (How do they honour the Father? Is it by *bowing* the knee?) He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which sent him.' We ask E. S. whether he honours the *Son*, as *Father*? If not, look to it! Does E. S. object, the *Sender* (Father) is distinct, and separate from the *Sent*? [Son.] We answer—The Sender *came with* the Sent. 'In the beginning was the *Word*, and the *Word* was with *God*, and the *Word* was God. [Or God *was* the word!] All things were made by *him;* [Who? Ans. The Word,] and *without him* was not any thing made that was made. And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.' John i. Christ likewise declares, vi. 51. 'I am the living *bread* which came down from heaven, 33d verse. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world; verse 63. The words that I speak unto you are Spirit, and are life.'—The '*bread* of God,' is here a convertible term for the *Word*. The Spirit! Will E. S. contend, that the Spirit, [of] God, and God are *two*? We think not. And this admitted, and the question is *settled!* 'The *Word* was made *flesh*. A body hast thou prepared me.' Who was the body [flesh] prepared for? Ans. The *Word*. Who prepared the body? Ans. The Word. For all things were made by him. If it is objected, that the Word which was made *flesh*, did not *prepare*, or *beget* the flesh, [being the only begotten] we answer—Christ says, 'For what things soever he [the Father] doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise!'

The remark of E. S. that 'there *must* be *two* such distinct characters and beings in existence, or they would not possibly be known;' if it proves any thing, proves too much for him. According to this, whatever is imaginary must be real; and all the heathen deities must exist. We think this will not answer. We request E. S. to recollect, that Christ spoke in *parables*. And farther, that Christ has explained, by saying, 'The words that I speak are *Spirit*, and are *life*.' Christ assumed the name of the '*Son of man*;' in allusion to being born of a woman. And the Jews considered him in no other light, than the Son of Joseph and Mary. Christ as the Son of man, spoke of his *flesh*. Christ figuratively represented himself as *bread*, the bread of life which came down from heaven. Spiritually God manifest in his flesh. The Jews understood the figure of the *bread*, in the same manner they considered Christ naturally. God manifest in the flesh, the only begotten of God, the Son of man, Christ, spoke of the Father in heaven. And Christ likewise spoke of himself, as being *in* heaven, while manifest in the flesh, on earth. See John iii. 12, 13. 'If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you heavenly things. And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but *he* that came *down* from heaven, the Son of man which is *in* heaven.'

If E. S. produced any evidence from the scriptures to support his declarations, that God and Christ are *two* unequal *beings*, and had *two* wills, and *two* understandings, and claim a *separate* regard, we think he would be entitled to notice. As the case stands, we do not think his word worth attending to, or meriting a serious refutation. Christ declared, that 'all should honour the *Son*, as they honour the *Father*.' If this is expressive of a *separate* regard, we would thank E. S. to tell us what the *reverse* of this means! We will simply ask the question, whether Moses' law, speaking of the regard in which God and idols should be considered, declared, that

all should honour them, as they honour God. If this can be proved, then E. S.'s assertion relative to his prohibitions, &c., will appear more reasonable!

Relative to Christ's *prohibiting* his disciples *asking* any thing of *himself*, we have *his* word for it! And——that is all! See John xiv. 13, 14. 'Whatsoever ye shall *ask* in *my* name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If *ye* shall *ask* any thing in *my* name, *I will do it!*' Reader, Do you call this a *prohibition?* And is it as plain as the prohibition of Moses, against bowing the knee to idols? We think *not!*

E. S. speaks of 'a complex deity, compounded of *opposite* names, natures, persons, and characters. Of this deity, we neither know, nor care any thing about. The God we worship, who is *in* Christ, is uniform, and consistent, in his *names*, person, and character. His names, are 'Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.' Here is nothing in opposition. His *nature* is Love! His *person* [in the *singular*, not persons,] is the *body* which he prepared, and is the 'Head of every man.' He is therefore, independent for his existence, *deriving*, if we may be allowed the expression, his *person* from himself. Here is nothing like opposition. His character is given by himself. 'The LORD, The LORD GOD, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth!' And he gave evidence of the *abundance* of his goodness, by rending the heavens and coming down, assuming our nature, and reconciling us to himself in the *body*, He *prepared*, on the tree.

E. S. continues---'For me to contend, that a *son* born of a woman, is quite as old as his *father*, by whom he was begotten, and the self-same being—a servant, mediator, and messenger, whom the great God sent, the *one* Immutable and Supreme Jehovah himself, would not only be giving the lie to plain Bible truth,' &c. 'As certain, as it is impossible for our heavenly Father to lie, when he declares, 'I am God, I change not, and *beside me* there is no God, nor any *like Me*.' To this, we answer—we are quite willing to test these premises by the scriptures, and reject so much as is repugnant to them, and retain what is retained *by* the Scriptures. The prophecy of Isaiah, of Christ, is as follows—'For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and *his name* shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.' According to E. S. we should give the *lie* to the *Bible*, unless we call him a *servant, messenger*, &c., and declare, that his character, and nature, is unequal and opposite to all this! Supposing an uniform was adopted by congress, for every grade of officers in the government, from the President, down to the most petty officer in the government, would the *acts* of the President cease to be *official*, if they were executed while he was in the *dress* of an *inferior*? Does the *dress* constitute the man? Does the man *change* with his dress? No! We ask, in the words of the prophet, '*Who is this* that cometh from Edom, with *died garments* (the *flesh*) from Bozrah? [Ans.] This glorious in his *apparel*, (the flesh. Not opposite and unequal,) travelling in the greatness of his strength? (Who was this? Ans.) I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save.' John in Rev. xix. speaking of this Saviour, refers to the crucifixion, and says—'And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him *was* called Faithful and True, [not unequal,] and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; (see Isaiah ix. 6.) and he had a name written (Saviour,) that no man knew, but himself; and he was *clothed with* a *vesture* dipped in blood; (the flesh,) and his name is called the Word of God. (the Word was made flesh.) And the armies in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen (righteousness) white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a *sharp* sword, (the gospel) that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; [denoting power. See Isaiah ix. 7.] and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his *vesture* (the flesh) and on his thigh a name written, [God manifest in the *flesh*] KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.' Is God, less God, because he *made flesh* his *vesture*, and dipped it in blood? It is God manifest in the flesh, Jesus the Saviour, to whom the Supreme title is applied, 'KING of kings, and LORD of lords.' We now ask, to whom does the Bible give the lie? And who gives the *lie* to the *Bible?*

E. S. says, 'Were I to undertake to *exchange* the nature, person, and the station of Jehovah, and his Messenger, the Mediator, whom he sent, and compound them *both* into *one* and the same immutable character and Infinite God, I should then presume to do more than my Almighty Father could accomplish, because he is without any variableness, or shadow of turning; and I cannot act so vain and presumptuous, as to pretend to do that which my Maker cannot perform.' We are willing to admit all the reason and argument this paragraph can possibly be supposed to contain. Nay, more, *add* to it, if you please, only preserve its *shape*, and see what E. S. will *prove*. Let E. S. in the first place define the *person* of Christ, (whom he considers as the Messenger) and point out the *difference?* If he will undertake this, we venture to assert he will be in no danger of compounding *both* into *one!* But we think there is great danger of a failure, on his part, of making the distinction, and telling what God's *person* is, distinct *from* Christ. The scriptures declare positively that *God is in Christ!* And when E. S. can define the personality of his *soul*, and the personality of his *spirit*, and make the distinction *evident*, and show that they are separate *persons*, and can be exchanged like *two apples*, we think he will be able to effect something by his present manner of reasoning, and not before! We wish E. S. to bear in mind, that if God is *unchangeable* in his *nature* and *character*, (and he says he is,) and the scriptures are true, [and E. S. has not yet formally disputed their authenticity,] then there *never* was a time when God was not *in Christ*, according to E. S.'s *own* premises! What is the character of God? Ans. SAVIOUR! What is the character of Christ, according to E. S. who contends for their '*opposite* unities,' characters, &c? What is *opposite* to Saviour? Ans. Destroyer! Is this, we ask, the character of Christ? Let the conscience of E. S. answer this question!

The conclusion of E. S.'s communication we think will not stand the test. Namely—'I shall continue to regard them as *two* separate, and *unequal* beings; and copy after *one*, in adoring the *other*, as my only God; as the best and most effectual *means I am acquainted with*, to perfect *my* holiness, and consummate my felicity in time, and to all eternity. Amen.' We think E. S. would make an excellent *Jew*, but will not do altogether for a *Christian*. Now, we have one question to ask. E. S. contends that Christ is *imperfect*, and *unequal*, &c. And he with a view to *perfect* his *holiness*, is determined to copy after this *imperfect* and *unequal* being—How long will it take E. S. to *perfect* his holiness, according to his premises?

'I and the Father are ONE!' Not TWO!

ABOMINABLE.

Extract from '*Universalism confounds and destroys itself.*' *By* JOSHUA SPALDING, *Pastor of a Church in Buckland.* Page 356. 'As the redeemed in heaven will for ever behold that awful sight in hell, that exquisite torture, horror and despair, they will have the best opportunity to see what *they themselves deserve*—from what they were redeemed—and the preciousness of that blood which redeemed them. They will for ever have the best opportunity to sing with sweet melodious joy, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour and glory, and blessing.

'The instance before us makes it pla in that the redeemed in heaven are *completely holy*. They look down and see their *own dearest kindred in hell*, under all the bitter agonies of death, and they stand *unmoved* at the *sight!* They maintain perfect calmness, and *undisturbed joy!!!* They hear the great Judge pronounce the final sentence; they see all the wicked sink down to hell, and hell moved with *devouring flames* to meet them; a sight infinitely more dreadful, than the sinking of worlds. At the same time, they begin the triumphant song, they see the power of God employed in the most terrible *manner* to make their *dearest* and nearest *connexions* for ever miserable. And *for this* display of his power, they ascribe unto him, blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and *thanksgiving!!! This consideration*, were there *no* other, is *proof* that the redeemed in heaven *stand complete in holiness!!!* They feel exactly as God does, according to their measure; or they are *filled with all the fulness of God!!!* This consideration, my friends, may also be *improved* for to search and *try* our own hearts. The question is, whether under our present trials, especially at the death of a dear relative, our conduct has any likeness to the example before us? Do we show submission to the will of God? Do we show to the world, love, and *joy* in the display of his power, his terrible majesty, and *glorious* justice? If we do not love these perfections of Deity, manifested in their *proper* effects, how can we delight in the riches of his grace? An heavenly temper must begin in this world!!! When death comes it is for ever too late. But O! the peace, the joy, and strength the soul feels, that is entirely swallowed up in God?'

Reader, we know of no terms in use among men sufficiently expressive to even *whisper* the detestation in which we hold the above sentiments. We, therefore, shall only observe, that according to the *qualification* above described, NERO, and ROBESPIERE, stood pre-eminent! And we think, that if the name of our Merciful heavenly Father was erased from this Extract, and the word devil substituted in its place, it would even then be speaking evil of his Satanic majesty in a measure, which, neither the scriptures, nor reason, would in any shape justify!!

Errata—In No. 35, page 143, in the 74th line from the top of the 3d column, the word *to*, should have been inserted between the words "*than that*" to have conveyed my meaning. Thus it stands in the manuscript (if I mistake not) in answer to "What death?" Ans. "No other than to *that* which was conferred by inspiration, and not only *could*, but *was* actually lost by interception'--If this is unintelligible let it be altered thus.—What death? Ans. no other than *to* that life which was conferred by inspiration, and not only could be, but was actually lost by sin.

IMPARTIALIST

Note—We inform Impartialist, that if he sends us any more communications, with an *appendix*, ("not to be published,") they must be couched in different terms; or we shall leave the whole to the *mercy* of the printers. It is in vain for any person to try to persuade the Editor that he has not *common sense*! Our correspondent will understand this.

ORTHODOXY.

Pretenders to orthodoxy have contended that evil originated in heaven, the residence of Deity; and in proof of this, their hypothesis, they refer to Rev. xii. 7. If this is truth, what then is the order of time established in the events related in this Book? Did all the events mentioned as taking place prior to this *war in heaven*, happen *before* the creation and fall of man? If not, then this war in heaven did *not* happen before the creation and fall of man! According to this, the common understanding of this *war in heaven*, a considerable part of the things related must have actually taken place before the creation, and the remainder, to have followed in regular succession, must have transpired long before our day; and therefore, there can be nothing future! It is a great pity that our *knowing ones*, who assume the name of '*Divine Doctors*,' did not think before they speak, and with all their knowledge, know this, that *premises* will have *conclusions*; and that those who *invent* the one, must confess their affinity with, and stand accountable for the others.

To Correspondents.

J.P.M. Requesting an exposition of Rev. xxi. 7. 8. is received, and will be noticed. Amator Veritatis' N.B. is received; likewise J.C. A Methodist, &c.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 1821. NO. 39.

Controversial.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Gospel Herald.

The scriptures of truth were written by holy men, who spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit of God. His Holy Spirit spake of spiritual things, and unless spiritually understood, we will misunderstand them. The *literal* understanding of the scriptures of truth, ofttimes converts them into such absurdities and contradictions, that many are induced to disbelieve their Divine authority altogether. Thus, by the letter of scripture, the church of Rome proves herself to be the true Christian church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail; that she is founded on the rock, Peter;—that none are saved out of the pale of the church; that all other denominations of Christians are heretics from the truth; that she is the pillar and ground of truth, and cannot err in matters of truth, &c. She proves, also, that the bread and wine in the last supper of our Lord, and in their mass, are the real flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, which was broken on the cross of wood, before his body was hung on the crucifix.

This literal method of understanding the scriptures of Holy Inspiration has produced the Calvinistic, the Rellyan, and other sectarian doctrines of *election of a few*, and *damnation of millions*. Ought not this literal method of explaining the scriptures to be superseded by that of the Spirit?*

The Editor in support of his doctrine, bravely handles the words of scripture literally, as a *keen* edged sword, to hew down all opposers. It appears, however, that he cannot support the doctrine of Universal, and *Unconditional salvation* without adopting the belief of the *pre-existence* of souls, and the *non-free-agency* of mankind; he has therefore added these two tenets. Thus, his doctrinal stool, on which he occasionally sits, has three legs, *unconditional salvation*, *pre-existence of souls*, and *non-free-agency*. At present he sits on it, as the Priestess of Apollo sat on her tripod, inflated with her God to utter oracles; and labours so skilfully, ingeniously, and industriously, and bruises his opponents so severely, that I am ready to tremble at my destiny for presuming to try the stability of two legs of his tripod.

And 1st. *Free-agency*. Sin arose from Adam and Eve's abuse of free-agency. Nothing but a free-agent appears capable of committing sin. For the sword or bullet that assassinates does not sin; nor is it accountable for the murder it commits. Why not? Because it has no intellect, no free-will, nor free-agency. Can a maniac be justly accountable for sin? No! Why not? Because his will and intellect is deranged to such a degree, that he is irrational, and incapable of free-agency, and free choice. He is mentally forced, and diseased. He is not accountable, for he is not a free-agent. It has been acknowledged that Adam was created in the image or Spirit of God, and made a free-agent. He was free to abide in the image and Spirit of God, and to feed on the bread of the tree of life, or depart from that Spirit and Image, and partake of the tree of worldly knowledge of good and evil, belonging to this animal life. He chose the latter; and in the same day died to all good from above, to live in all evil below. That is, he died spiritually and lived animally; having cast himself out of Paradise into the worldly nature. Hence the origin of sin is properly derived from a free-agent's transgression of the law of God. If, therefore, God had never created a free-agent, sin could never have come into existence; for none but free-agents ever did, or ever can criminally and penally commit sin. For if I am inevitably compelled to do an act, whether good or evil, it is not I that do it, but the power that compels me to be a mere instrument in his hand. Hence none but free-agents are, or can be accountable for their actions; and hence, every one is a free-agent *at the time* he commits a sin, otherwise he never could have penally sinned. Consequently, all sinners have been free-agents. All men are sinners, according to the Editor's belief; yet he denies that any of Adam's posterity are free-agents; then it follows, that none of Adam's posterity have ever sinned; how then can he prove that all men are sinners, and that Paul, after his call to the apostleship, was the chief of them. I answer, by the *pre-existence of souls*, which is the next leg of his tripod.

I say 2d. *Pre-existence of souls:* for he supposes that the souls of all men, past, present, and to come, (an innumerable host!) were created when God created all things in six days, and all very good; consequently, nothing has (in agreement with this idea) been created since. A writer in the Gospel Herald wished to know in *what place* these souls pre-existed, and what has occupied their attention. I will answer, if the Editor pleases, that, (supposing the Presbyterian catechism is true,) all souls pre-existed *in Adam* when he sinned, and were in him before his fall. For it says, 'We sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression.' But how wonderfully! O how inconceivably small! must all souls have been, to have had their habitations in one man's body !!! Yet small as they were, they must have had understanding, will, and free-agency; and have participated in Adam's temptation, sin and death. 'As in Adam all die, (i. e. then died;) so in Christ we shall all be made alive,' [i. e. was *made* alive] is a text quoted to confirm this. Granting this to be true, these pre-existing souls must have been damned, [I conclude] until Christ made them alive, about 4000 years afterward; when all souls (in conformity to the Editor's opinion) were drawn unto, and into Christ at the time he was lifted up on the crucifix. I hope I do not misapprehend, for I do not intend to misrepresent the Editor's ideas in my observations. And as I believe I do not, I am reflecting upon the infinite minuteness of all the pre-existent octillions of souls inhabiting the body and soul of Adam. And how astonishing it is, that they all knew what Adam was tempted to do; and consented to his iniquity, and consequently incurred and deserved the same punishment.

But I deny that all things were created about six thousand years ago, for the scriptures speak of the creation of things since that period. Thus Ps. cii. 18, the Psalmist says, 'this shall be written for the generations to come, and the people which shall be *created* shall praise thee.' This very clearly intimates that the generations to come were to be *created*. And to corroborate this, the Psalmist describes his natural generation as a *creation* of his members in *succession;* saying, Lord, 'Thou hast covered me in my mother's womb—for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; my substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret. Thine eyes did see my substance, *yet* being *imperfect;* and in thy book all my *members* were written, which *in continuance* were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.' Ps. cxxxix. 13 to 16. He speaks also of the Divine birth as a *new creation;* saying, '*create* in me, O God, a clean heart, and *renew* a right spirit within me. Paul supports this idea where he says, 'We are his workmanship *created* in Christ Jesus unto good works.' Ephes. ii. 10. 'For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing nor uncircumcision, but the *new creature*.' Gal. vi. 15. This *new creature* is a *new creation*. Then *old* things pass away and all things become *new*.' 2 Cor. v. 17. That creation was not ended with the six days creation is proved by Job xxxi. 15. 'Did not he that made me in the womb make him?' See also Isa. xliv. 2. Jer. xxxi. 22. Matthew i. 17. Isaiah lxv. 17. 2 Maccab. vii. 22. Indeed, lice were created, when 'Aaron stretched out his hand with his rod and smote the dust of the earth, and it became lice in man and beast; and all the dust of the land became lice,' &c. Ex. viii. We may as well believe that all grasses and trees, animalcules, and elephants, and all living things that ever were or will be, were created in the six days creation, as that all souls were then created. In this way we shall believe in the pre-existence of every vegetable and animal production, from the commencement of creation to the termination of the world. Agreeably with this idea, all the oak-trees that have been, or ever will be, must have existed in the original oak or parent tree.* The like may be said of every other thing that has animal, or vegetable life. How small, how astonishingly minute must those animalcules have been, that the aggregate of millions and perhaps more was contained in their first parent!!!

I think, Mr. Editor, that you must be convinced from what I have said, that two legs of the tripod are broken; that the non-free-agency is erroneous; and the pre-existence of souls preposterous; that the third leg, *unconditional salvation*, is incapable of supporting yourself, or the stool, being itself much injured and disabled by the loss of its fellows. I hope, however, to have the pleasure of seeing you reinstated on the seat, by replacing it with good and substantial legs, such as shall not again be broken by the feeble efforts of your friend,

REPREHENSOR.

REMARKS.

Of the *first* paragraph of Reprehensor's communication, if the premises contained in it are true, we say, that the Church of Rome has better authority for their *errors*, than our modern Arminians have for theirs. We think, however, this might be questioned; but not being introduced particularly as a *fact*, which can to a reasonable mind militate against the faith we advocate, we pass it by.

Reprehensor's *second* paragraph commences with the following—'This *literal* method of understanding the Scriptures of Holy Inspiration, has produced the Calvinistic, the *Rellyan*, and other sectarian doctrines of *election of a few*, and *damnation of millions*. Ought not this literal method of explaining the Scriptures, to be superseded by that of the Spirit?'†

* By Leuwenhock's enumeration, a female codfish had above nine millions of eggs in her. Let us postulate that each egg of the first codfish had a perfect codfish in embryo; that each embryo codfish had, also, in this first codfish, its several nine million of eggs with their embryotic codfish; and so on, in arithmetical proportion for all the generation of fishes that ever was or shall be; and this incalculable number of codfish that must have been in that first female, and the infinite minuteness of the last generation in her, obviously demonstrate the folly of this postulate. I know Paul said that Levi was in the loins of Abraham, and paid tithes in Abraham to Melchisedeck. But I cannot believe that Levi's body or soul, literally speaking, was in Abraham's loins. It has certainly a more rational meaning; and I would be pleased to have it better illustrated.

† Our readers will please to notice the admirable *consistency* of Reprehensor; who pretends the *literal* understanding of the Scriptures damns millions: and accuses us, of 'handling the Scriptures *literally*' to prove the *salvation of all!* Now we have an infallible guide, to the true understanding of the Scriptures, in the declaration of Jesus, the Saviour; who declared, 'Man shall not live by bread alone; but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.—And the words

* We took the liberty to expunge a sentence, which commenced this paragraph. And we leave it to the conscience of the writer, to determine whose motives were most *pure*, he in *writing*, or we in striking it *out!*

This is the first time we ever heard of a '*Rellyan* doctrine of election, which damned millions.' We think Reprehensor is mistaken.

His *third* paragraph represents us, as adding *two tenets*—the '*pre-existence* of souls,' and the '*non-free-agency* of mankind;' and he says, we 'cannot support the doctrine of Universal and unconditional salvation without them,' &c. We inform Reprehensor, that these *two tenets* were connected with the *truth* long before he was born. We consider these 'two tenets' to be truth; we, therefore, contend for the truth. Reprehensor represents us as sitting on our *doctrinal stool*, or *tripod*, and at the conclusion of his communication, *exults* in the idea of having broken *two*, out of the *three* legs, of our *tripod*. Now we have no objection to humour the *conceit*; we therefore, declare, that we will oppose the *remaining leg* against all the arguments *he* can bring, and prove the final happiness of the *whole race of Adam!* We, however, shall examine his pretensions. And, relative to his *fourth* paragraph, we have only to say, that Reprehensor has *refuted himself!* The intelligent reader will see this without showing! Of his *fifth* paragraph, we remark, Reprehensor quoting Paul's declaration,—'As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive,' says, '*Granting* this to be true,' &c. Was Reprehensor aware of the meaning of the words he used? '*Granting this to be true!*' Does the truth of the Scriptures depend upon the courtesy of Reprehensor? We think not.

Reprehensor in his *sixth* paragraph, having introduced several passages from the Scriptures, and condescendingly, we presume, granted them to be true, (at least, we suppose it, he not mentioning any thing to the contrary,) we shall notice them, &c. He commences, by saying, 'But *I deny* that all things were *created* about six thousand years ago, for the Scriptures speak of the creation of things *since* that period. Thus in Psalm cii. 18. 'This shall be written for the generations to come, and the people which shall be *created* shall praise thee.' We request Reprehensor to bear in mind, that when he commenced, he was of opinion that a *spiritual* understanding of the scriptures was sometimes necessary. We think so too. And we believe, that spiritually understood, they are consistent and harmonize. We shall take the liberty to explain the Scriptures, by the Scriptures. In other words,—We shall examine, and admit the explanations which the inspired writers themselves give. See Eccles. i. 4. 9, 10, &c. 'Generation passeth away, and generation cometh; but the earth abideth forever. The thing that hath been, it *is that* which shall be; and that which is done, *is* that which shall be done, and *there is* no new thing under the sun. Is there *any* thing whereof it may be said, See, *this is new?* It hath been already of old time, which was before us.' Reprehensor may apply this *literally* to the bodies (generations) of men, or *spiritually* to their *souls*, or both. We freely give him his choice! Now, let David speak. We first premise, however, that our correspondent believes in the existence of the soul, *after* the death (passing away of the generation) of the body. This granted, and we presume he cannot deny it, and we ask no favours. Now, let David speak for himself. See verse 3. 'For my *days* are consumed like smoke.' See 11, 12 verses. 'My *days are* like a shadow that declineth; and *I am withered* like grass. But thou, O Lord, shalt endure (experience no change,) for ever.' We ask, is the *soul* of David in *existence?* This must be answered in the affirmative. Was the *days*, or *generation* of David, the soul of David? If so, when the *days*, or *generation* of David, was consumed and withered, his *soul* was consumed and withered! David proceeds—'When the Lord shall build up Zion, he shall appear in his glory, v. 16. 'This shall be written for the *generations* to come; and the people which shall be *created* shall praise the Lord. For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the Lord behold the earth; to hear the groaning of the prisoner; to loose those that are appointed to death. to declare the name of the Lord in Zion, and his praise in Jerusalem; when the *people* are *gathered* (*created*) together, and the kingdoms to serve the Lord.'—We ask, When was this? We answer, See 16 v. 'When the Lord shall build up Zion, he shall appear in his glory.' Then his praise shall be in Jerusalem. When? 'When the people are *gathered* together, and the kingdoms to serve the Lord.'—The words *created* and *gathered* are used in the same sense, by the prophet, and are, therefore, convertible terms, and explanatory of the subject treated of. Reprehensor continues—'This very clearly intimates that the generations to come were to be *created*—and to corroborate this, the Psalmist describes his natural generation as a *creation* of his *members*,' &c. Quere. What has this to do with the *soul?* Reprehensor continues—'He speaks also of the divine birth as a *new creation*; saying, 'Create in me, O God, a clean heart, and *renew* a right spirit within me.' We observe, the words *create* and *renew* are here convertible terms. And we ask, How can a thing be said to be *renewed*, which had no previous existence? Reprehensor continues, 'Paul supports this idea, when he says, 'We are his workmanship *created* in Christ Jesus unto good works.' Ephes. ii. 10. 'For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but the new creature.' Gal. vi. 15. This *new creature* is a *new creation*. Then old things pass away and all things *become* new. 2 Cor. v. 17.' Reader, Reprehensor has quoted these passages to prove that the *soul* did not *exist*, or have a *being*, before the body. Now we shall prove by these very passages that it had. You will please to notice, that all this *new creation* is in *Christ*, and Paul's authority in this matter is admitted by Reprehensor; we have only to remark, that the same Paul said, 'As *in Adam* all *die*, even so [precisely] *in Christ* shall all be made *alive!*' Now, whatever Reprehensor makes this *life*, which he describes as a *new creation*, to be, it will be precisely to the extent of the *death* in Adam. And if Reprehensor can prove that the *death* in Adam was *nothing at all*, he will then prove that the *new creation* in Christ is nothing at all, likewise! If Reprehensor will examine the original, he will find that the *new creation* is a *regeneration* of our nature in Christ. And if he will examine his own language, 'Then old things pass away, and all things *become* new,' he will find that it is the *old* things which become new!

Reprehensor continues—'That creation was not *ended* with the six days creation, is proved by Job xxxi. 15. 'Did not he that *made* me in the womb make him? (We add the remainder—'And did not one *fashion* us,' &c. The word *make* and *fashion*, are here convertible terms. There was nothing *created* in the sense Reprehensor would have it; but fashioned, moulded and built up, &c.) See also Isaiah xliv. 2.' We quote this with pleasure. 'Thus saith the Lord that *made* thee, and *formed* thee from the womb.' Now we acknowledge that every thing belonging to, and constituting the being of man, was produced originally by God; but mark the phraseology—'and *formed* thee,' &c. His next quotation, Jere. xxxi. 22. 'For the Lord hath *created* a new *thing* in the earth, A woman shall compass a man;' when he *defines* the thing *created*, we pledge ourselves to prove it to be something beside the *soul!* His alluding to Matt. i. 17. is a secret. We see no analogy between that and the subject under discussion. His quotation from Isa. lxv. 17. Is the regeneration, or *restoring* of all things in Christ. The remarks we made on his quotations from Paul, are applicable here, and we think, are more than sufficient. Of his reference to Maccab. we remark, our Bible is complete without it. Of the *dust* becoming *lice*, we remark—If Aaron had *produced* lice *without* the *dust*, we should have no objection to his making use of the word *creation!*

Reprehensor says, 'We may as well believe that all *grasses* and *trees*, animalcules, and elephants, and all living things that ever were or will be, were *created* in the *six days* creation, as that all *souls* were *then created*,' &c. Now we inform Reprehensor, that we could have 'made a long story short,' and should have done it, had it not been for our wish to convince him that our *tripod* could stand on *one leg!* Reprehensor was so obliging as to 'beg the question;' or in other words, accommodated us with a *creed* to his own liking, and then manfully attempted to demolish it! Reader, has he effected his purpose? Relative to our *present* mode of existence, we consider the *body* in its relative connexion with the *soul*, as a *house* is to the body. This *tabernacle* of *clay* will be dissolved; but we have an house not *made* (no creation here!) with hands, eternal *in the heavens!* In the language of inspiration, we say, 'Lord, thou hast been *our dwelling place in all generations*. BEFORE the mountains were brought forth, or *ever* thou hadst formed the earth and the world, *even from* everlasting *to* everlasting, thou God! Thou *turnest* man (the clay tabernacle) to destruction; and sayest, *Return*, (be *renewed, restored,*) ye children of men!' (Not the soul. See 1 Cor. xv. 51 to 58.) Of grasses and trees, the scripture declares, 'Let the earth *bring forth grass*, the herb yielding seed, the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself.' And the earth continues to *bring* (that which *was* created) forth, not *create*. Relative to making, or *creating* elephants, we think there is not a very close analogy between an elephant and the *soul* of man; and we are quite willing Reprehensor should make, or create as many elephants as he pleases. We, however, are of opnion, that the Creator originally gave nature *reproductive* powers; (not power to *create*) to *reproduce* that, which he at *first produced*. (Created.)

Relative to 'Leuwenhock's enumeration,' and Reprehensor's 'postulate,' there may be much 'folly' in both, for we aught know; still we see *very* little analogy between a '*codfish*' and the *soul* of man!

Reprehensor in concluding, observes—'I think, Mr. Editor, that you must be convinced from what I have said, that two legs of your tripod are broken,' &c. Now we think, Mr. Reprehensor, that our tripod is *whole*, your elephants and lice to the contrary notwithstanding; and will remain so, unless it is assailed by an opponent who can wield a weapon more formidable than a '*codfish*,' or her '*eggs!*'

Note. Reprehensor has made a liberal use of the term 'free-agent.' We should be gratified, if he would inform us what chapter and verse contains this term. We suggest to him the propriety of inquiring, what constitutes an *agent;* and whether the term *free*, means *free*, or *bound?* The scriptures declare, of man, that 'In God he lives, moves, and has his being; and in him are all his ways.' An *agent* is one who acts for *another*. There is a covenant, or agreement entered into, and the agent is *bound* to fulfil his contract; then, the *employer* is bound to compensate him. In this case, the agent is not *free;* for he is *bound* by a covenant. If men lived, moved, and had their being in themselves, they would be *free!* But they would not be *agents*, unless they *covenanted* with a second person; then they would not be *free*, for their covenant would *bind* them! There is, therefore, as much propriety in saying '*free-agent*,' as there would be in saying '*free-slave*,' and no more! For the agent is as much *bound* by his *covenant*, as the galley slave with his *chain;* and of the two, we think his chain the most *galling*, since the *whip* would chastise the *slave* at the *oar*, and eternal damnation the slave to this MONSTER IN ORTHODOXY!

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR—I was not a little surprised on being informed not long since, that a composition of mine was published in one of the Numbers of the Herald. I have reference to the piece signed Amator Veritatis in No. 27 of your paper. This piece was written as a grammar school exercise, and handed to a friend for perusal; who transmitted it to you without either my knowledge or consent. My astonishment was increased on reading your remarks relating to my situation and standing in society, which are wholly without foundation. I am not a student at divinity; nor am I under the *particular instruction* of the Presbyterian clergyman of Morristown. I am no more under his tuition than any other member of his church. It is but a few months since I left my trade, and entered

---

that I speak unto you, they are *spirit*, and they are *life*.' They, therefore, who construe the Scriptures to the *destruction* of the souls of men, know nothing about them' Let this be remembered!

the grammar school of this place, where I am now engaged in the study of the Latin. Equally without foundation, is your suspicion of my having assistance in this production. He whom you suspected never read it until after its publication. I in justice to him and the cause of truth, have thought it my duty to make this explanation; and to request you to insert it in the Herald. I would not be understood as charging you with intentional misrepresentation; I presume you have said no more than was told you. But you have published what is false, and therefore, as an honest man I expect you immediately to rectify it.

I do feel sorry, Sir, that a school-boy's exercise should have given you so much labour and trouble, as to fill a great part of three papers with an answer. I think, Sir, that it will be very difficult for you to convince any, excepting those who have a desire to indulge in iniquity, and therefore wish that what you have said might be correct. That a sentiment so unreasonable is correct, as that of imagining that the Courtesan whose life is devoted to prostitution, shall leave this world to enjoy eternal bliss—that the drunkard, who devotes himself to the worship of Bacchus alone, at last shall sing the praises of the Lamb—that the duelist, from the field of combat soars aloft to rest in a world of glory—that the scoffer, whose last breath is employed in blaspheming, shall be conducted from this vale of tears to a land of endless felicity—In short that the most vile characters, whose malignancy to the character of God continues till the last, shall be for ever blessed. Before this can be believed, we shall be obliged wilfully to blind our eyes, and to disregard the word of God, *which says*, concerning our race when their day of probation is past, 'He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still. Rev. xxii. 11. As for entering into a controversy, I do not feel disposed to engage in a discussion of it. I feel perfectly willing to leave it where Christ leaves it. 'He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.'

Please to publish this letter in your next paper; and as you have been so kind as to send the other numbers out, please to send me the one you publish this in. Your's, &c.

MR. EDITOR,—

I do not wish you to publish my communication except you have word from me to do it; I now think of writing another to take the place of it. A recent conversation with Mr.———has led me to think that as full an explanation has not been given as might have been.

Your's
AMATOR VERITATIS.

N.B.

Since writing the above, I have learned from a conversation with the person who transmitted the piece in question to you, that he was led to think by the manner in which it was written, and something that was said prior to the time it was handed to him, that I intended it for publication. Yet in this manner I have wrote several of my academic exercises that I never had the least idea of appearing before the public, which then was unknown to him. As to what had been said, he requested me to prove, if I could, that the idea of a *Universal restitution* is erroneous. He said if I would write, he would have it published. I declined writing for publication; but at the same time told him, I could easily make it appear by many passages of Scripture, that the before-mentioned doctrine is incorrect. Afterwards, I left my production at his house for his own use, not expecting it to appear in public print. Yet still had he insisted on its publication, I believe I should have consented, but should not have expected to have engaged in a controversy; for in my present situation I have no time to devote to that purpose. Mr.—— says, that he not remembering that I declined, considered the piece for publication, and therefore took it in, without mentioning the thing to me. I in the mean time, willingly gave up the idea of its being published; for it was not written with a view of entering into a controversy. Mr.———has further informed me, that the erroneous representation concerning my standing in society, was given through a mistake; and that he understood it so from what he had heard others say. I would have you understand, Sir, that this is written for a further *explanation*, and not for a *contradiction* of any thing that has been said before. Since my piece has been published and answered, though it was unexpected to me, had the answer been calm reasoning, instead of railing, I believe I should have replied to your queries and then ended, for reasons before assigned.

SIR,—

I wrote to you not to publish the communication which you have in possession, unless you should receive word from me to do it. I now request you to publish it immediately; and the N. B. in connexion with it, which I think, will answer as well as a new communication.

I am your's in haste,
AMATOR VERITATIS.

REMARKS.

It was observed by a distinguished writer, that 'a man's *pretensions* are the standard by which the world generally judge of his *merit*.' In the case in question we had no evidence of the qualifications of the writer, Amator Veritatis, which equalled his own pretensions; and which, if we are to judge from his language in the communication alluded to, were, we think, as much as a *man* could reasonably pretend to; and that he promised more, than any man we ever saw could *perform!* 'My *design* (said he) in the following remarks, is, to show the *incorrectness* of the principles of those termed Universalists,' &c. And in his N. B. he says, speaking of his conversation, &c. 'but at the same time told him, that *I could easily* make it appear by many passages of Scripture that the before mentioned doctrine is *incorrect*.' Whether he now *pleads* his situation, and claims the appellation of *school-boy*, from a conviction of having *failed* in his attempt, we shall not presume to say! Finding therefore, that Amator Veritatis deals altogether in *pretensions*, we shall examine some of them, and dimiss the subject.

And first. We believe him to be *sincere*, when he pretends he is *sorry* on account of the *length* of our remarks on his first communication! Our answer, however, instead of '*filling* a great part of *three* papers,' would not occupy *one!* And the recollection, that it is only to the *wise*, that 'a word is *sufficient*,' will account for the length of it. In his N. B. he *pretends*, that had our 'answer been calm reasoning instead of *railing*, he believes he should have replied,' &c. Now it is our opinion, that to declare the truth, does not necessarily make the person who declares it a *railer*. The following, from his *second* paragraph, we fear will subject *him* to the charge, in the opinion of the sober and well informed part of the community. Namely—'I think, Sir, that it will be very difficult for you to convince any, excepting those who have a desire to indulge in iniquity, and therefore, *wish* that what you have said might be correct. That a sentiment so unreasonable is correct, as that of imagining that a *courtesan*, whose life is devoted to prostitution, shall leave this world to enjoy eternal bliss,' &c. &c. *We* shall not call this *railing* only, but SLANDER! We ask this *school-boy*;—You have said, that millions of your brethren, of Adam's race, will be *endlessly miserable*;—do you *wish* that which *you* have said might be *correct*?' If you do, we shall leave it for your conscience in your sober moments to tell you in emphatic language your *name!* We *wish* that the sentiments we advocate 'might be correct;' for an inspired apostle has assured us, that we may approach the *throne of God* with this wish in our mouth, which he says 'is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who *will have all men to be saved*, and come to the knowledge of the truth!' Our Divine Redeemer, when on earth, declared to the Pharisees of that day, that 'publicans and *harlots* should *enter* the kingdom of heaven *before* them.' Christ did not tell the Pharisees that it was impossible for *harlots* ever to enter the kingdom of heaven, and that the Pharisees as a necessary consequence should read their own fate, and be endlessly miserable; but reproved their *self-righteousness!* His declaration is positive, that *harlots* should *enter*; and that, *before* these great pretenders to goodness. The *school-boy* continues—'Before this can be believed, we shall be obliged *wilfully* to blind our eyes, and to disregard the word of God, *which says*, concerning our race when their *day of probation is past*, 'he that is unjust, let him be unjust still,' &c. If he believed the declaration, see Rev. xxii. 18, 'If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add *unto him* the plagues that are written in this book,' in the sense he *pretends* he does, we think he would not have *wilfully* perverted, and *added* unto it, in the manner he has done. Can he produce the word of God, which speaks of the 'probation of our race being past,' and applies the words he has quoted to them? We have recently had this subject under consideration, in our 37th Number; and as we are requested to forward this Number, we shall forward that likewise, directed to Amator Veritatis, &c. We inform him, however, that with the exception of the regular Numbers forwarded to our Subscribers, *we* sent none to Morristown. We likewise inform him, that we are also willing 'to leave it where Christ leaves it. 'He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.' We also inform him, that Universalists believe *all* that he does [of the truth] and a great deal more truth! consequently, however he may dispose of others, he will be obliged to admit the truth of *their* salvation on his *own* premises!

Relative to our mistake respecting his '*standing in society*,' he says, 'I am not a *student at divinity*,' &c; and that the communication published in our 27th Number, 'was written as a *grammar school exercise*;' &c. We assure him, we never supposed he was studying *divinity*; although from his style and manner of reasoning, we thought it very likely he might be under the tuition of the Presbyterian clergyman at Morristown. And although he says, 'In this manner I have written several of my grammar school exercises,' we are quite willing to believe he has no intention to become a clergyman; and that he is not under the tuition *of* a clergyman. Now, we seriously advise him, instead of spending his time in these 'grammar school exercises,' to devote that part of it at least, and as much more as is convenient, to the unprejudiced study and examination of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Let human traditions and doctrines alone. Search for the truth. Admit the supposition that you have not yet found it; and ask wisdom to direct you of Him, 'who giveth liberally, and upbraideth not!' Instead of slandering those who may differ from you in sentiment, by declaring of their sentiments, that it would 'be very difficult to convince any of their *truth*, excepting those who *desire* to indulge in *iniquity*,' inquire, first, into the characters and conduct of those you criminate; and if you find they are as free from sin as those of your own sect, acknowledge the truth, wherever you may find it. Remember that a distinguished apostle of Christ, Paul, confessed himself to be the *chief* of sinners; and although no *courtesan* in the character, and possessing the disposition of an harlot, will ever be admitted into heaven, still God is able to 'wash them with pure water, and create a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within them.' And since God has declared, that 'All nations whom he hath made shall come and worship before him, and glorify his name;' blame not those who believe it; but rather inquire if they can be damned according to your understanding of the term, when Christ has declared, of those that worship God, that 'they *must* worship him in spirit, and in truth.' Had you *measured* your pretensions, and proved your declarations; in fine, had you justified your pretensions by a corresponding knowledge of the Scriptures, and of human nature, and had you proved your declarations by other testimony than your own opinion, we should have acknowledged the one, and respected the other. Under existing circumstances, however, we take our leave with this short advice, that, although

——"Great boats may venture more,
Little boats should keep in shore!"

1st month 1, 1821.

FRIEND FITZ,—

I WAS disappointed when I discovered in No. 36, thy *Punctilio*, in which thou didst refuse to publish my last communication on account of the omission of the title of thy publication. If I am in an error in this point, I wish to be convinced. My last was wrote in haste; and upon reading the copy thereof, to one of my intimate friends, he was dissatisfied with my remarks upon the title of your publication; said, that he considered thee justifiable in thus using the term. Now I think, inasmuch as thou hast promised to publish my communications with candour, and hath promised the same in thy Prospectus, that thou canst not avoid publishing my communication, and by fair argument convince me, if I am mistaken, and if I remain unconvinced, thou shouldest indulge me enough to admit my communications, provided they did not miscarry on account of the title being omitted. But if thou wilt remain obstinate, I will also; and will force a copy of my last through some other medium. WILLIAM DEAN.

ANSWER.

Friend Dean labours under a mistaken view of our arrangement. We make no *ex post facto laws*. Any manuscript found in our letter-box posterior to the date of our 36th Number, comes within the prohibition. Our motive for publishing a *particular* notice to our *correspondents*, is, to establish their precedence; and by arranging their communications in the order in which they are received, to prevent misunderstanding on the part of our correspondents, and save the Editor from the charge of favouritism. Friend Dean's communication, therefore, will receive attention, &c. We likewise, inform Friend Dean, that his *omission* of the *title* of this paper was supposed to be unintentional on his part; and as such, would not have been noticed, had he not obliged us to notice it by assigning a motive so hostile to principles, which we from the heart believe to be truth. And although Paul declared, 'Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend;' we are persuaded, that had Paul's brother been offended at *his gospel*, Paul would have preached it, if *all* the world had been offended! At least, this is our opinion, and if Paul would *not*---WE WILL!!!

TRUTH AND ERROR.

'God has assured mankind that there is and can be *no salvation*, but through Jesus Christ. That *for the sake*, and on the account, of *his* sacrificial sufferings and death he *can* forgive sins; and on *no other* account *will he* show mercy to *any* soul of man. Ephes. i. 7.' Reader, who after attentively reading this, would imagine, that the writer of it believed, or certainly pretended to believe, that there can be *no salvation*, but through the *faith* and *obedience* (works) of the creature? This writer was Dr. Adam Clarke. And he likewise, declared, '*After* the resurrection comes the general *judgment*, in which God shall *render* unto every *man* according as *his works* have been.' Put *this* and *that* together. What do you make of them? One declaration, is, that *salvation* and forgiveness of sin, shall be—no! The language is more emphatic! 'He (God,) *can* forgive sins, on account of the merits of *Christ*; and on *no other* account *will*,' &c. Then, he adds, 'God shall render unto every man according as *his works* have been.' Not according to the 'sacrificial sufferings and death of *Christ!*' No! But on '*another account*,' and one, too, as *different*, as is possible for human reason to conceive of. It is related of the Rev. Mr. Wesley, the founder of the Methodist sect, by a person who heard him preach when he was *eighty* years of age, that Mr. Wesley speaking of sinners excusing themselves, said, 'When we exhort sinners to repentance, they say, *we do as well as we can*. But I, said this venerable Arminian, *I never did so well as I could, for ONE HALF HOUR in my life!!!*' Now, Doctor Clarke, what will become of Mr. Wesley, if *his*, and *your* doctrine is *true*, and he told the *truth*, (and we rather think he did,) what shall be rendered unto *him*? Doctor Clarke shall answer for himself. 'God shall render unto every man (this includes Mr. W.) according as *his* works have been.' Mr. W. shall answer for *himself*. What have *your* works been, Mr. W? Ans. 'I never did so well as I *could* for *one half hour* in my life.' Then Mr. W. if your and Dr. C.'s doctrine is *truth*, you will not *enjoy happiness* for *one half hour* throughout the wasteless ages of *eternity!* Reader, if there is truth in the *premises*, there *must* be truth in the *conclusions*. Now we believe the premises are false. If not, none of the human race will be saved. For 'He that offends in *one* point is guilty of all.' Then, they are *all* guilty *of* all! This is preaching *Universal damnation* with a witness!

Our first quotation, however, from Dr. C. is *truth*. God *can* save all; and salvation is through *Christ*, and on account of his merits, &c., and God never will save one soul on any other account; call it by whatever name you please.

THE SHADOW MISTAKEN FOR THE SUBSTANCE.

We are of opinion, that a person well acquainted by experience with the customs and pious regulations of our New-England brethren, and who still savours of them, must read with some surprise the following declaration of Paul, who, it would seem, had never seen a '*tything man*,' or paraded the streets on Sunday with a '*long pole*' in his hand, in all his life! Paul said, 'Let no man, therefore, *judge you* in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an *holy day*, or of the new moon, or of the *sabbath days*; which are a *shadow* of things to come; but the body *is* of Christ.' Col. ii. 16. Our New-England brethren, we fear, have mistaken the *shadow* for the *substance*; and numbers, to our knowledge, have been *judged*, not only *of*, but during the *sabbath*-day, and the pious justice has *pocketed* his part of the fine, the fourth commandment to the contrary notwithstanding! Among the pious customs prevalent there, is the *beginning* of the sabbath on *Saturday evening*. The authority for this order (or rather disorder) of time, was derived from the declaration contained in Genesis i. 'And the evening and the morning were the *first* day.' They, therefore, concluded, that if the *first* day had an evening and morning, the sabbath-day must have an evening and morning *too*, and that the *evening* must, according to course, *begin* the day; consequently, *Saturday* evening was declared to be Sunday *morning*, by right of primogeniture, although they reversed the order of nature, and as an expiation, made the Sabbath evening *unholy!* Many, and long, have been the arguments entered into by the Hopkinsians, and Arminians, relative to the duty of this countermarch of time; notwithstanding which, the Hopkinsian persisted in his orthodoxy, and the Arminian in his sacrilege. Now, surprising as it may seem to those who are in the habit of seeing things *as they are*, still it is a fact, that the Hopkinsians never could be persuaded, but that the *first day* that ever was, had an *evening beforehand!*

"*But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that you may be the children of your Father which is in heaven, &c. Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect.*" *Matt. v.*

Reader, these are the words of your God and Judge. This is the *testimony*, and we are instructed by it; that to imitate our heavenly Father, we must love even our enemies. Does God love his enemies? Yes! An inspired apostle declares, that 'God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. For if when we were *enemies* we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.' Rom. v. And the same apostle declares, that 'neither life, nor death, nor things present, nor things to come, &c. shall be able to separate us from his love,' &c. viii. The character of God is here explained. God is Love. God is perfect. God is unchangeable. The reverse of this, is the character of the devil. The devil hates—is imperfect—he is mutable. 'Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer! He that loveth not his brother abideth in death!' 1 Epis. John iii. Can that man be said to *love* his brother, who *rejoices* in his eternal misery? If so, that man would *hate* his brother, who should sympathize in his sufferings, and labour for his happiness. The Saviour says, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are *heavy laden*, and I will give you rest, &c. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.'—How many at this day, are heavy laden by 'wolves in sheep's clothing,' who are self-righteous Pharisees, who 'make merchandise of, and lay heavy burdens' upon their fellows? To such, the call of Christ is peculiarly emphatic. Their present taskmasters put a yoke upon their necks, and a burden upon their shoulders, which no man can bear. Neither do they give any rest to the souls of their poor deluded, deceived hearers, who so far from *finding* rest to their souls, are threatened by their soul-keepers, with interminable wretchedness! No longer, we entreat you, give ear to their slanders against your Father who is in heaven. For 'the *thief* cometh not but for to *steal*, and to *kill*, and to *destroy!* I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good Shepherd. The good Shepherd *giveth his life* for the Sheep.' (He does not sound the loud amen to their interminable misery, nor rejoice in the suffering of even his enemies—but dies for them!) John x. Therefore, '*come unto me*, all *ye* that labour and are *heavy laden*, and I will *give you rest*. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart, *and ye shall find rest unto your souls*. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.' Matt. xi.

Note.—Reader, have you found rest to *your* soul? If not, it is because you have not *learned* of Christ! Are you not tired of your burden? Or do you prefer a *heavy yoke*?

INSTALLATION.

The Rev. ELIAS SMITH will be installed as pastor over the '*Third Universalist Society*' in this town, on Wednesday next, Jan. 3.

Boston U. Magazine.

DEDICATIONS.

The new Meeting-House belonging to the '*First Universalist Society*' in Roxbury, will be dedicated to the service of Almighty God, on Thursday next, Jan. 4.

Ibid.

The dedication of the *Universalist Meeting-House* in Milford, takes place on Wednesday next.

Ibid.

QUERE.

Paul in his Epistle to the Heb. iii. 17, 18. interrogates—'But with whom was he grieved forty years? *Was it* not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not?' If it is contended that those who were prohibited by God from entering into the rest, here spoken of, will never be *saved*, we ask, How then, will you be able to admit, or prove, the salvation of Moses? God told Moses he should *not enter*; and Moses 'fell in the wilderness!'

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Doddridge is received, and will be attended to. Likewise, A. South, requesting an exposition of Psalm xi. 6. and Rev. xiv. 11. &c.

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1821. NO. 40.

Controversial.

COMMUNICATION.

TO THE PUBLIC.

THE EDITOR and PRINTER may have observed, that in most of my communications the title of this periodical publication was omitted. I suppose they were of opinion that it was done unintentionally, and therefore added the title at the head of my communications. I now inform, that I am *conscientious* of calling this publication the *Gospel Herald.* It is an insult to the Majesty of heaven to call it the Gospel, for the Scriptures declare, Rom. i. 16. that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that *believeth;* to the Jews first and also to the Greeks. Is the Gospel the power of God corporeal? Let the Editor look at this. Is thy publication the power of God unto salvation? Art thou invested with absolute power to make it universally effectual? Canst thou make it universally beneficial without all power in heaven and in the earth? And canst thou save the whole race of Adam by it, if thou hadst all power, without exercising a despotical government? Art thou a tyrant? Is thy God a tyrant, who hath all power? Art thou not ashamed of thy gospel? Paul was not ashamed of Christ's gospel, look at the text. 'I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' Paul's Christ was no tyrant; he offered his salvation upon conditions, saying, John vi. 27. 'Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which endureth unto everlasting life. John xiii. 17. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.' James owns this Christ, James ii. 14. 'What doth it profit my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and hath not works, will faith save him?' The 12 following verses are of the same import, and demonstrated to be true in the most positive manner by the works of Abraham and Rahab. Have all complied with the conditions—done the works that Christ hath appointed, and obeyed his gospel? Ans. No. Rom. x. 16. they have not all obeyed the gospel. What will become of those that disobey it. Ans. 2 Thess. i. 7, 8, 9, 10. 'And to you that are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day.' Here the rest of the saints that obeyed, and believed the gospel, is first described; while the unbelievers who obeyed not are said to be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord. Now, if Friend Fitz will collect all the particles of matter which once constituted the existence of those unbelievers, reunite together the same atoms (otherwise the same form cannot be produced by the same particles) by chemical affinity producing the same identical victims, and bring them in the presence of God and force salvation upon them, by his gospel, the Herald, then I will believe that they will not be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of God. Is this publication the power of God? If so, then are my communications with those on Deism; excuse me, and in future call it the *Jargon Herald,* a term justly applied to thy answer in No. 31 and 32, which will thus appear.

Friendly readers, in maintaining a controversy I have always considered it a mark of wisdom to take certain grounds; dig to the rock; suffer the mind to penetrate into the bottom of the subject, and fortify the place with the most solid arguments, and play a volley of shot, regardless of all the strange manœuvres, magic pranks, ridiculous satirical language of an adversary to decoy one from his post; for although such animadversions might be admired by the weak, yet it is beneath the *dignity of a philosopher* or Christian to notice them, and in the end attack the adversary upon his own ground, by pointing out the inconsistency of his own system. But *alas*—my present antagonist is incompetent. Destitute of a philosophical mind; and I am obliged to *abandon* my *project,* and will at the present answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit. However, I expect to present before you the concluding communication.

In the Editor's first paragraph No. 31. p. 128. 2d col. he says, Friend Dean's shots fell half way; in the second he says, had Friend Dean consulted our answer to his questions instead of his prejudices, we think he would have done much better, the success he has had in overthrowinghereditaryguilt or refuting what we have not contended for, is a victory we shall not dispute his title to. Answer, The Editor in his answers found fault with my questions and arguments, and I had good reason to think that he was hostile to my doctrine, much more I knew he was, for in his remarks on Philotheus No. 10. p. 38. col. 2. he says, 'Did not all mankind, Adam excepted, suffer the consequence of sin, death, without being actual transgressors by overt acts in their own persons, and did not all men, therefore, suffer the innocent with the guilty?' And col. 3. 'For mankind fell in Adam without transgressions in their own individual capacities, for their nature being impure by the transgression of the first Adam, and afterward, by their own transgression.' Can words be more plain in favour of the doctrine of hereditary guilt? See also, a communication from another Universalist, signed Witness, No. 30. col. 2. 'And as we had such a being in Adam as rendered us partakers of his transgression and death.' Now I ask, with whom was I fighting when I obtained this victory? And where did Dean's shot fall, when the Editor fled for refuge into the Quaker's camp, and proffered friendship by this exclamation, we neither believe nor advocate the doctrine, that the sin of Adam is the sin of his posterity, if so they are not contaminated with his guilt.

The latter part of the second paragraph, contains a lengthy exposition upon that *visionary* doctrine which some are pleased to call *regeneration;* which is in fact no regeneration at all, respecting our finding a lost body after the death of the animal body, which would be nothing but restoration, recovery. Hear him explain it in his 5th paragraph No. 32. reckoning from the commencement of No. 30. 'What is regeneration? What is generation, or to generate? Ans. It is to produce, consequently, regeneration is reproduction; and to regenerate, is to reproduce that which had been produced, or generated, and was lost.' Have I erred in calling this a visionary doctrine? If a part of a body is lost by casualty, and if it is afterwards recovered and combines in its former position, this is a reunion or recovery; a modification that existed before. But regeneration is *synonymous* with re-creation, or transformation; implying nothing short of a re-creation of matter, producing a change in a created body that never before existed. By *transformation* a worm is first *generated,* and a form produced, that never before existed. This same worm is operated upon by a certain principle, which changes it by a gradual proc ss into another form which never existed before. Now if a silk worm should understand the laws of nature—become convinced that its salvation is conditional, that it must spin a covering to undergo the change while in the Aurelia, otherwise never obtain the new Image—should one of these happen to make its cone upon the tree of knowledge, of good and evil, which is ingenous to its growth in regeneration, and in consequence of its mistake, lose the image of the fly that had been in part regenerated upon the image of the worm, would this worm when it comes to die, find a perfect image of the fly for its reception? Could it say, that it was an image that it had lost, which it never had in perfect possession? If the worm enters into the image of the fly as soon as it dies, or is crushed by a stroke of a hammer, and if the image of the fly existed 1800 years before the worm, and that which appeared 1800 years after was the first birth, and existed prior to that which was 1800 years before it, and if the worm is changed by a principle that never came in contract with it, or ever operated upon it through any other medium that was in contract with both principles, if the clapper of a bell can be heard under an exhausted receiver, if man can see objects, without the reflection of light,—and if all worms are regenerated into the image of the fly, then the Editor's doctrine is correct.

The next declaration of the Editor runs thus, "It would be an absurdity too great for comparison to contend that man in his imperfect state is in the image of God." And Christ saith Mat. 19, 28, 'Ye which have followed me in the regeneration,' mark, it is in the past tense, it is in this life. Paul speaking to the Colossians, iii. 9, 10. saith, 'Lie not to one another, seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.' Again, Ephes. iv. verse 23, 24. 'Be renewed in the spirit of your minds, put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.' This is in this life, they being renewed in knowledge daily, after the image of him that created them. At the beginning of the sixth paragraph, the Editor says, 'If the soul of man is mortal, and God has power to make it immortal, he has power to unmake it.' At the middle of the same, he saith, 'before he (Adam) transgressed, he was immortal and spiritually alive; this was the image of God. When he died spiritually, he became of the earth alone, earthy.' Here the Editor is got in what he calls Friend Dean's crucible, a plain and open confession of my doctrine that he ridiculed in No. 23, page 96, col. 1st. Quere. How is the Almighty agoing to unmake the Divine image, without decomposition? There is no other way under heaven, it is now inexpressibly wonderfully true. Notice also, he saith, when he (Adam) died spiritually, he became of the earth alone earthy. Now look again at page 93, col. 1st, if it is more wonderful still that I should avow this doctrine there, there remained nothing but the earthly image which was dust, it is now still more wonderful still, that he should confess it. Now if I can prove that this dust returned again to the eternal voids of utter darkness, then it will be dreadful, dreadful, true, but he may likewise confess it. I hope the Editor will not make such a blunder as to sentence me to eternal misery for my plainness, in this communication, for it would trouble me much; it is a good cause in his hand, and I would rejoice to provoke the advocates for the doctrine of eternal misery into an engagement with him, that the world might see their overthrow, but they are all ashamed.

The Editor's battle is so long contrary to what he promised in the first paragraph, that I am obliged to pass by his 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. From the 12, to the 21, he is busily employed to prove that immortality and eternal life is not only obtained by patient continuance in well doing. To obtain his ends, he collects all those passages which des-

cribes the state of man in unregeneration, and their impure works which proceeds from their own nature, and placing regeneration beyond the grave, or dissolution of the animal body, so as to fix these complaints upon all during their existence, carefully avoiding those passages that speak of bringing forth works meet for repentance; of denying our animal life, dying with Christ, dying daily, being buried by baptism unto death with Christ, raised with him into newness of life, having crucified the old man with the affections and lusts,and put on the new man, bringing forth good works through the medium of Christ that worketh in them to will and to do. But texts without conditions, and rewards for good works, were so exceeding rare, a number were introduced; look at one and be satisfied! Col. xvi. If any man's work abide that he hath built thereon,he shall receive a reward; labours hard to prove that all will be saved without faith,and that faith is preserved without works, carefully avoiding all those passages that make works absolutely necessary, as where Paul saith, I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith, henceforth there is a crown laid up for me, and then, carefully selects those passages that was applied to certain bodies of Ghristians that had witnessed a change, and had risen with Christ into newness of life, that because they stood steadfast, unmoveable, were a peculiar people zealous of good works, they should all be saved. These passages are taken in hand by the cunning spirit of this world, or serpent nature in the Editor, and applied to the whole race of Adam, and here a licentious door is opened as broad as the way that leads to destruction. But this astonishing monster has leaped beyond the infinite bounds of eternal destruction, to gather together the outcasts of the earth. It is fearful that he will bring back all Israel, of whom the Almighty swore in his wrath that they should not enter into his rest. For all Israel shall be saved; 'but they are not all Israel that are of Israel.' Those that are of Israel, are the wrestling seed that wrestle for the blessing, believing in the doctrine of conditional salvation. Will this creature also bring back Judas Iscariot? Christ hath testified that he hath lost him, the son of perdition. In his next paragraph 23, he is in *pursuit* of the Syrians that were burnt up, both soul and body, of the wicked, that were punished with everlasting destruction!

I wonder if these ungodly men, when recovered, can enjoy the happiness of Heaven with their ungodly dispositions without a change. AndI see not how they can be changed after death without the operation of Christ's Spirit; and then I would suppose, that it would have to come into contract, and require time to work the change. This would bring them again into a probationary state in some planet; but perhaps I mistake, for I do not understand Magic, neither will I call the Editor a Wizard in plain terms, for he does not pretend to do it himself, but has only discovered how Christ does it, and I have no prospect of being brought to understand it; and I wish if Friend Fitz is weary of me, that he will candidly inform. However, I must be permitted to address the public through thy medium, by an examination of your principles, upon the soundest principles of philosophy. I wish to hear again from Philotheus, Theophilus, and Timotheus.

The Editor, and Printer, will confer a favour on themselves if they should inform individually who are the persons that use so little paper, and write blindly. I wish to give satisfaction, but know not who is meant.

WILLIAM DEAN.

REMARKS.

We hope our readers will make some allowance for Friend Dean, who appears at times to be a little beside himself; but who on the whole, when he is under the guidance of reason, is very moderate and well disposed. It is possible some of our readers may consider this *ironically* spoken. But we assure them we are sincere,and are heartily sorry for Friend Dean, who appears to be in a great measure divested of his reason.

We publish the gospel Paul published; and 'it is the power of God to every one that *believeth*' it; and to none else. We cannot make it effectual; neither could Paul, who declared—'Paul may plant, and Apollos may water, but God alone giveth the increase. By *grace* are ye saved, through *faith*, and *that* not of yourselves, it is the *gift* of God.' The grace, favour, or love of God, is the *cause*; and *faith*, when he pleases to *give* it, is the means, through which men arrive at the knowledge of their salvation. Paul declared to the idolatrous Athenians, that they were the *offspring* of God. He taught that God was the *Saviour of all men*—that it was his purpose and *good* pleasure to *gather all in Christ*—that Christ gave himself a *ransom for all*, to be testified in due time. And Paul continued to his death, proclaiming these truths to mankind, unawed by the frowns, and uninfluenced by the applause of men. Friend Dean omitted an important part of his quotation from John vi. 27. Of the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, John adds, 'Which the Son of man *shall* give unto you,' &c. The quotation from James, we conceive is misapplied. James is not speaking of the salvation of the *soul*, but the relieving the poor from *bodily* sufferings by offices of charity. Now all the human race are *spiritually poor*, and blind, and naked. Will God their heavenly Father, who is *rich* in spiritual blessings, say unto them, 'Be ye warm---be ye clothed,' &c., and give them nothing? Let Christ answer---'Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, *shall* he not much more *clothe* you, *O ye of little faith*?' The quotation from 2 Thes. 1, &c. we have recently noticed, as applicable to the Jews, and referring in point of time, to the destruction of Jerusalem. The remainder of this *first* paragraph we pass over, after again requesting the reader to make proper allowance for Friend Dean's waywardness.

Friend Dean's second paragraph, we turn over to the reader, again requesting him to consider the state of the writer's mind, and judge favourably. We, however, suggest to Friend Dean the propriety of devoting in future, that part of his time to composing his communications which is least marked with this effervescence, which characterizes the present communication,and which, we fear, may be disagreeable to the sober judgment of our readers.

Friend Dean in his third paragraph, introduces a quotation from our 10th Number, p. 38. 2d col. with a view to prove that we advocate the doctrine of *hereditary* guilt, or the *individual* sin of Adam being the sin of his posterity. We have examined the 38th page, and have no reason to detract from any thing there advanced. An exposition of the meaning we attach to the *words* we use, appears to be necessary; for Friend Dean, we think, does not understand them. The word *hereditary*, as it is properly defined, *descending* by inheritance, in a qualified sense, *must* be received by Friend Dean on his own system. If Friend Dean inherits (receives) his father's *disposition*, the *cause* exists in him, which existed in his *father*, and the effects in a certain ratio *must* be similar. This, however, is a term we can do without; and for a good reason, it is useless to us, and we resign it to Friend Dean altogether. In the quotation alluded to, it was asked---'Did not all mankind, Adam excepted, *suffer* the consequence of sin, *death*, without being *actual* transgressors by *overt acts* in their own *persons*?' We now ask, What is the meaning of '*overt acts*?' Ans. Acts which are so *public* as to be of themselves *apparent*. The reader will probably anticipate our application of this to Paul's exposition, see Rom. v. 16.which we consider as explanatory of the subject; especially, taken in connexion with the 12th verse. Now, what do 'overt *acts*,' (plural) mean? Ans. Not *one*, but *many* acts! *One* act, in which all mankind participated, was the *cause*---death was the consequence. What is the meaning of the word '*person*?' Ans. One's *self*, and not a *representative*. We, therefore, declare, that mankind *personally* did not sin with Adam *after* the fall by a *repetition* of sinful *acts*, which constituted them sinners; neither did they fall by a *plurality* of crime; and it follows as an inevitable consequence, that the *sins* of Adam have nothing to do with his *posterity!* We have no hesitation in saying, that the doctrine of *imputation*, as generally taught according to the express import of the word *imputation*, is an absurdity almost without a parallel! What is the meaning of the word *impute*? Ans. To charge upon a person a *virtue*, or a *crime*, which does not belong to him; which he neither *merits*, nor *deserves*. Reader, blasphemy is defined to consist in *speaking evil of God*. Can you conceive of a more flagrant accusation, than the declaration that God charges to the *account*, and *punishes* his creatures for crimes *they* never *committed*? No! You cannot. We have that charity for our fellows to believe, that if they were aware of the full import of the terms they frequently use in speaking of the Deity, they would not make use of them. Harsh as it may sound to some ears, nevertheless it is a solemn *truth*, that did mankind generally attribute to one another the *disposition*, and apply the same *epithets* they do to their Maker, there are very few, if any, who would calmly pocket the *insult!* What would you say of that man, who would forge a consideration,and rob a man in a suit at law of his property on a pretence? Frowns would sit in terrible array upon your brow—indignation would flash from your eyes—and your language would be anathemas. Beware, then, how you accuse your God of dashing from the lips of his creature the ephemeral cup of human bliss, and damning him with interminable wretchedness! Paul has explained what *he* meant by what is called *imputation*. See Rom. v. 13. 'For until the law, sin was in the world: but sin is *not* imputed when there is *no* law.' (v.14.) But Paul says, 'Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.' Recollect, we asked, 'Did not all mankind, Adam *excepted*, suffer the consequence of sin, *death*,' &c. What was Adam's transgression? Ans. *Overt acts*. But Paul declares positively, that 'death passed upon all men, for that all *have* sinned.' v. 12. Why, then, was not sin *imputed* to these offenders? Did not they suffer *death*? Granted—they suffered that as the consequence of having violated every law in existence, which they had any knowledge of. But from Adam to Moses, there was no *new* law for them to *violate*; consequently, no sin was laid to *their charge*; 'By the law is the knowledge of sin.' In this sense, it is impossible to *impute* that to a man, of which he is *guilty*; for imputation in the sense Paul here uses it, is the charging a man with *sin*, when there can be no sin charged, for there is *no law* to transgress! The conduct of God, therefore, is justified. When the law was given, sin could not be imputed. It would be absurd to talk of imputing that to a man, of which he was guilty. It does not follow, because sin is *not* imputed when there is *no* law, that sin will be imputed when there *is*. By turning to chap. iv. 3. you will notice 'Abraham believed God, and it was *counted* unto him for righteousness.' The word translated *counted*, is the same which is translated *imputed* in the 22d and 23d verses. The scriptures declare, that Jehovah is a '*Just* God and a *Saviour*.' But they no where declare, that he is a *just* God, and a *destroyer!* God never will *impute* sin to any man. But his righteousness, salvation, is a *free gift*. And God is just in giving of his righteousness to them, because 'the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, &c., even the righteousness of God *which is* by faith of Jesus Christ, *unto all*, and *upon* all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.' Would the *imputation*, or laying to the charge of a man, guilt of any description, *impart* that guilt to him? No! Would the *imputation* of purity, or righteousness, to a man, *impart* that righteousness to him? No! The declaration of Paul, (see Rom. iii.) is emphatic. He describes all men universally, as sinners, *not* by imputation, or imparting of guilt, but by *actual* transgression. He declares that 'the righteousness of God (is) by faith *of* (not *in*) Jesus Christ *unto* all, and *upon* all them that believe, for there is *no* difference. (Why?) For all *have* sinned and come short of the glory of God.' Here is no imputation! 'All *have* sinned!' Now we contend with Paul, that there is *no diffe-*

rence! The apostle James proves this incontestably, by saying, 'He that offends in *one point* is guilty of *all*.' Now in the common acceptation and application of the term imputation, the 'righteousness of God, (and without it there can be no salvation) is not, nor never will be imputed to one of the race of Adam. Why? Paul answers—'Being justified *freely* by *his* grace, through (by the means of) the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.' Then it is the grace of God *freely given*, (not acquired) which is the cause of justification. If you *give* a man a dollar, it is his; as much as it was your's *before* you gave it to him! Suppose you were to give a dollar to a man, who previously to his receiving it was not worth *one mill*, could you then with any propriety impute him to be worth one dollar, when you knew he was actually the rightful possessor and owner of the dollar? It would be impossible. And were you to deprive him for ever of the dollar, after giving it to him, because he did not perform certain conditions which you named, *after* you promised and gave him the dollar, you would then prove your promise and act *false*, and would be guilty of flagrant deception and falsehood! These are premises and conclusions which infidelity may deny, and sophistry may attempt to evade, but they can never be *controverted*. The declaration of Paul, see Rom. viii. 20. 'For the creature (*ktisis*—the *creation* of God,) was made subject to vanity, *not willingly*, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope;' has been misconstrued to mean, that the creature (all men) did not *willingly*, and with *their consent* subject *themselves* to vanity, or sin. The Scriptures declare, that 'God has *no* pleasure in the *death* of him that *dieth*, but that he should *turn* and *live*.' In one case, then, God has *no* pleasure—but God *has* pleasure in the other. It is his *good pleasure* to gather all in Christ.' It is *God* who made the creature—but not *ekousa*, volens, *gladly* make him *liable*, or subject to sin, and misery its consequence! What *did* he make him for? Why did he make him subject (liable) to vanity? The apostle answers—'But by reason (this is why God did it,) of him [Who? Ans. God] who hath subjected *the same* in HOPE.' Reader, what do you *hope* for? Is it happiness, or misery? Did you ever know *one* of the creation of God who hoped for endless wretchedness? No! Never! God did not willingly [gladly] permit man, his creation to sin and suffer—nay, more, if the words of the apostle mean any thing, they declare in the most emphatic terms, that God would *not* have done it, except for the good which should result to the creature from it. Is it asked---What authority have you for this? We answer in the words of the apostle;---'Because the creature (the creation, as many as were subjected to vanity) also *shall be delivered* from the *bondage* of corruption, into the *glorious liberty* of the *children* of God!' Should any object, these are the *elect;* we answer---then the *non-elect* were not subjected, and stand in no *need* of deliverance! Again, The same apostle, see Heb. ii. 14, 15. speaking of Christ, says, 'Forasmuch then as the *children are partakers* of flesh and blood, [subject to vanity,] he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might *destroy* him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death, were *all their lifetime* subject to *bondage*.' We ask the Calvinist---Are the *elect* 'through fear of death *all* their lifetime subject to bondage?' We ask the Arminian---Are your *good pious* folks, 'who watch and pray till they are *justified*---and continue to watch and pray, &c., until they are *sanctified*---and continue the same course, &c., until they are *glorified*'---are they 'all their lifetime through fear of death subject to bondage?' Will Christ effect his purpose? Or will he fail; and instead of destroying the *devil*, will the devil for ever reign, and triumph in the *destruction* of those whom Christ *died to deliver and to save?* These are questions of vast import. They deserve an answer; and we venture to assert, that except the salvation of *all* the human race is admitted, they never will be answered consistently with reason, revelation, or the character of Christ. We have adduced testimony which no Calvinist can *controvert*, nor Arminian can *confute;* and we tell them plainly, that as pretenders to the character of honest men, they are bound, either to confess the *conclusions*, or to deny the *premises!* We again ask, Will not Christ effect his purpose? We tell—nay, we have proved beyond the *possibility* of refutation, what that purpose is;—the salvation of the '*whole creation of God!*' We call upon the Calvinist to prove to the contrary. We tell them they cannot do it! We call upon the Arminian to answer our questions. Will not Christ effect his purpose; which purpose you acknowledge to be the salvation of the world? Christ declared, '*all* power in heaven and earth was his;' is not that sufficient to save *all?* Christ declared, 'The Father loveth the Son and hath given *all* things into his hands;' does not his jurisdiction extend over *all?* Christ declared, 'thou hast given him power over *all flesh*, that he should give eternal life to as *many* as thou hast given him;' Are not *all* his?' 'For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater, *so shall my word be* that goeth forth out of my mouth; *it shall not return unto me void*, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it *shall prosper in the thing* whereto I sent. For ye shall go out with *joy*, and be led forth with *peace;* (not be endlessly miserable,) the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field [men] shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree; and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign *that* shall not be *cut off*.' Reader, the *Word* went forth and was made *flesh!* We ask *you;* Shall this Word (Jesus the Saviour) *accomplish* the end, and *prosper* in the thing whereto it was sent? God has promised, will not he *perform?* We ask the Calvinist—Show one particle of vegetation which never was *watered* with the *rain* and *dew* of heaven? We ask the Arminian,—Prove, if you can, that the *grass ever performed one condition?* There never was any *vegetation* but was *watered* with the *rain* of heaven! And there never was a *soul*, but will '*go out with joy*, and be led forth with *peace!* And he said, It is a *light thing* that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also *give* [not barter and trade] thee for a light to the Gentiles, *that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth.* SING, O HEAVENS, AND BE JOYFUL, O EARTH; and break forth into singing, O mountains; for the Lord hath comforted his people, and will have mercy upon his afflicted. But Zion said, The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me. Can a *woman forget* her sucking child, that she should *not* have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, *they may forget*, yet will I *not forget thee!* Behold, I have graven thee upon the palm of my hands; [nailed upon the cross] thy walls *are* continually before me.' Isaiah lv. xlix.

Friend Dean in his *third* paragraph, likewise quotes from page 38, 3d col. 'For mankind fell in Adam without transgression in their own *individual capacities*, for their nature being impure by the transgression of the first Adam, and afterwards by their own transgression;' and asks—'Can words be more *plain* in favour of hereditary guilt?' We have considered Adam as possessing *personality* (a mortal body) in contradistinction to all his brethren of the human family, at the time in question, they not at that time being in their individual capacities clothed with the flesh; therefore, their *personal identity* was not apparent, except in Adam the first their earthly head, having the precedence of them in his, and their *mode* of existence! Paul says, Adam is the *figure* of him that was to come. Paul likewise, says, 'Ye are dead, and your *life* is hid with Christ in God.' Paul here speaks in the *present* tense. Again, Paul says, 'As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall (in the *future* tense) all be made alive.' Although we believe all mankind died spiritually at the fall, at the *time* Adam died, still, Adam had the *precedence* in suffering death in his own individual capacity, (person.) Christ of whom Adam was the figure, and who is the Spiritual head of every man, *rose* from the dead in his own individual capacity, (person, the flesh,) *before* his members. Paul speaking of our being made alive in Christ, says, 'but every man in his *own order*.' The order is *two*-fold. 'Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming.' Apply this *order* to Adam. Adam was the *first* fruits of *death;* afterwards they that were (of) Adam, they suffered in their own *individual* capacities. Remember that Paul is speaking of the resurrection, when life and immortality will be enjoyed by all men. This is future. In the present tense, Paul says, 'Ye are dead, and your *life* is hid with Christ in God.' Mankind, therefore, spiritually rose with Christ; agreeable to the declaration of the apostle. 'We were crucified *with* him, buried *with* him, and have risen *with* him,' &c. So man *spiritually* died *with* Adam. It may appear remarkable to our readers, that we should be assailed on the *one* hand by correspondents for believing in the pre-existence of the soul; and on the *other* hand by another, for believing Adam's sin was charged to the account of those, who had no existence 5000 years after it was committed! How it could have entered Friend Dean's head, that the view entertained of this subject by pretenders to orthodoxy, should be *our's*, is, to us, unaccountable. We believe in *original sin;* so does Friend Dean; if he believes there is any sin. Every thing which has had a beginning, had an *origin*. But to believe a man had a part in, or could be guilty of perpetrating a crime which was committed thousands of years before he had *any* existence, is a conclusion that we wash our hands of! If Friend Dean will read our answer to his *first* communication with attention, and examine his communication likewise, we think he will discover that he has pursued a different course from what he at first pointed out. He there declares his abhorrence of the doctrine of endless misery, as contrary to the attributes of Divine Mercy. He has since advocated the doctrine of the *annihilation* of the wicked; as though the utter destruction of soul and body was *consistent* with Divine Mercy! He was *shocked* to think we advocated *unconditional* salvation. He said he believed, 'that Adam and all his posterity were created, and born under the *necessity* of a Saviour, to regenerate them out of the image of Adam, or earthly nature, into the image of God, the Divine nature.' What are we to understand by the word *necessity?* Did man create *himself;* or had he any agency in his *birth*, or being? From whence proceeded the *necessity?* Not from man; for a *cause* cannot proceed from an *effect!* Here is a death-blow to every thing that looks like free-agency. What! Create a man *without legs*, and then annihilate him because he does not *walk?* Absurd beyond description. Salvation *conditional*,—what in this case would be the condition? Surely *legs;* for the man cannot walk without them; and none but the being who *caused* the necessity, can *remove* it! There never was an Arminian who could solve this mystery. They invariably contend, that the man of himself must first walk *without legs*, and then, to reward him *for* walking, *legs* shall be *given* him!—Relative to our fleeing into the *Quaker's camp*, we inform Friend Dean, that we have a poor opinion of, and shall never seek protection in a camp, where a martial law is proclaimed which condemns to *annihilation* every man who will not walk *without legs!*

Friend Dean commences his *fourth* paragraph, by calling our, (or rather the Scripture) doctrine of regeneration a *visionary* doctrine. He says it is 'finding a *body*, after the death of the animal body,' &c. It is difficult for us to believe that Friend Dean would have *perverted* our statement in this manner if he had read it with any degree of attention. He has confounded *regeneration* with *resurrection!* If Friend Dean will turn to our 35th Number, page 144, 3d col. he will find a particular examination of this subject; and a true definition of the original words, &c. And farther, until he, or some other person shall produce better evidence that we are in an *error*, than a confused account of '*silk worms, flies*, and *bell-clappers*,' we trust we shall be excused, if we continue to adhere to our sentiments, &c. The declaration of Friend Dean, that '*regeneration* is synonymous with *recreation* or *transformation*,' is an error too gross, to pass without an animadversion. Friend Dean has undertaken to *confute* the

doctrine we advocate. And we submit to the judgment of the candid reader, whether any person is justified in introducing as *synonymous*, words of acknowledged and proved incongruity. Friend Dean must consult his DICTIONARY! Friend Dean's remark, that the 'Editor is destitute of a philosophical mind,' will be readily acknowledged, if by *philosophy* he means that state of the mind which can receive as common sense the declaration, 'by *transformation* a worm is first *generated!*'

Friend Dean commences his *fifth* paragraph, with the following quotation from our answer,&c. 'It would be an absurdity too great for comparison,to contend that man in his *imperfect* state is in the image of God,' and to prove this an error, introduces the following quotations from the Scriptures.—First. Matt. xix. 28, 'Ye which have followed me in the regeneration;' and adds, 'Mark, it is in the *past* tense,' &c. We too, say, Mark well the declaration. It is done! It is in Christ, the head of every man. It appears Friend Dean would have it that the disciples of Christ were regenerated, or (as he confounds the terms,) born again, at the time Christ spoke these words, in their *own* persons, and were actually in the image of God. Now we are instructed that Peter after this, denied Christ with oaths; and all the disciples forsook him! Were they in the *perfect* image of God in their own persons at this time? His second quotation is from Col. iii. 8,9. 'Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new *man* (not the perfect image of God,) which is renewed in *knowledge*,(regeneration is in Christ) *after* (not *in*) the image of him that created him.' We ask,—What is that? Answer, See 11 v. 'Where there is neither Greek, nor Jew,' &c. The same Paul declared to the Galatians iii. 28. 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, (why?) for ye are all one *in* Christ!' We request Friend Dean to put the question to himself, or any other person who thinks he is in the image of God.—Is there any distinction in your mind; do you regard all as one in Christ? He then quotes Ephes. iv. 23, 24. Now we shall take the liberty to add the 22 verse, which, we think, explains the passage, 'That ye put off *concerning* the *former conversation*, the *old* man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed *in* the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which *after* God is created in righteousness and true holiness.' Now, Friend Dean, mark what follows.—'Wherefore, (says Paul, in consequence of what he had before said,) putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour, (why so?) for we are members one of another.' Paul in this chapter cautions the Ephesians, and informs them, that God is the '*Father of all!*' Now we inform Friend Dean, that his declaration relative to God the 'Father of all,' *annihilating* his children, is not speaking truth to his neighbour! We also inform him, that this is incontestable evidence, that he is not '*renewed* in the spirit' of *his* mind! He has the old man yet! See 13 v. 'Till we *all come* in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God,unto a perfect man, (Christ the Head, all mankind the members) unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' We ask Friend Dean—Can this ever happen if your doctrine of the annihilation of a part of mankind, the members of the body of Christ, is true; will 'the measure of the stature of the *fulness* of Christ,' ever be completed? No! Never! Friend Dean in his exultation relative to his *crucible*, and what he takes for a confession on our part, is as usual, *mistaken!* If Friend Dean will examine our 150th page, 3d col. he will find the following cause assigned, instead of *decomposition*, 'Man by *transgression*,died, and lost the knowledge of his *origin*. He was no longer *immortal* by his intimate union with the *Spirit* of God,' &c. Friend Dean has uniformly avoided answering our interrogatories, and for a reason, we presume, too obvious to mention. Therefore, we shall not be surprised if he should omit answering the following. Our readers will recollect,that according to Friend Dean, mankind were '*decomposed*—all that remained of man was *dust*'—and that this 'dust returned to the *eternal* voids of utter darkness.' We therefore wish Friend Dean to tell how they are to get out of this *eternal* void? He will please to recollect, that *dust* cannot *act;* and he meaning by *eternal*, an *endless* duration, he is requested to reconcile this with conditional salvation—free agency, &c. It requires no argument to reconcile this with his doctrine of annihilation; for it amounts to that. The only difficulty is, for Friend Dean, who according to his premises has been *eternally* annihilated, to account for his *present* existence! His remark, that we sentenced him to eternal misery, wants confirmation! We presume our readers will indulge Friend Dean by accepting his excuse for passing by our *seventh* to the *eleventh* paragraph, inclusive, as he says he was *obliged* to do it!

Friend Dean in his remarks, relative to our answer, numbered from the *twelfth* to the *twenty-first* paragraphs, inclusive, we are sorry to say, is disingenuous. We shall submit to the candour of our readers, our answer, and this part of his reply, only remarking, that his charging us with 'placing regeneration *beyond* the grave,' &c. betrays either a gross mistake, or astonishing ignorance. Friend Dean has expressed an opinion respecting the Israelites being destroyed eternally, and left it to the imagination of the reader to locate the astonishing Monster, &c. This, however, is but a trifle. Now we inform Friend Dean, that the rest into which the Israelites were prevented from entering, was the land of Canaan. And that even Moses was excluded from that rest! Paul, See Heb. iv. 8, 9, speaking of this very people, says, 'For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not *afterwards* have spoken of *another* day. There *remaineth*, therefore, a rest for the people of God.' We can abundantly prove, and would had we room, that those who fell in the wilderness, were emphatically the people of God, and beloved by him. We cannot well avoid telling Friend Dean, that we think it is out of character for a Quaker, to *incase himself* in Calvinistic, or Hopkinsian armour! We allude to the use he makes of the *disjointed* passage, See Rom. ix. 6.—'For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel.' It is our opinion that if Friend Dean's eyes had been opened, that he could have seen the shattered state of his *borrowed* armour, and counted the shot holes, he would not have put it on! It is only necessary for Friend Dean to read attentively the iv. Rom. 10 to 18, and then read his quotation, taking the connexion, and beginning at the third verse, and reading to the 8th, and we believe he, if he understands the passages in question, will shake off his Hopkinsian armour with disgust. We, however, remark, that we think he has improved a little upon the passage. He defines the true Israel to consist of those "who believe in conditional salvation!" We should like to hear Friend Dean preach a sermon on "conditional salvation," taking Rom. ix. 11. for his text! Friend Dean continues his queries, and asks,—"Will this creature also bring back Judas Iscariot? Christ hath testified, that he hath lost *him, the son of perdition.*" We inform Friend Dean, that Christ *never* testified any such thing.

Friend Dean commences his last paragraph, by "wondering if these ungodly men (the Syrians, &c.) when *recovered*, can enjoy the happiness of heaven with their ungodly dispositions, without a change." We answer, no! But God will change them. We think it important, that a term in so frequent use as the term *ungodly*, should be understood. What is it to be *godly?* We answer, it is not to damn our neighbours,—neither is it to exalt ourselves and abase others, who perhaps, are as holy as ourselves. But it is to be like God. In proportion as a man is like God, he is *godly*. "God is Love!" He is a 'SAVIOUR;' not a destroyer! "He is good to all; and his *tender mercies* are over all his works. He is not willing that any should perish; but that all should come to repentance. He maketh his sun to rise on the evil, and on the good; and sendeth rain on the just, and on the unjust. He will swallow up death in victory; and the LORD GOD will *wipe away tears from off all faces.* Out of the *multitude* of his mercies he will have compassion, for he doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men." This is the glorious character of our God! To be *godly*, is to imitate God in his mercy and compassion, which is as unbounded as his creation, and as eternal as his eternity! Therefore, to be *ungodly*, is to be the *reverse* of this.—To be *hatred*,—to be a *destroyer*,—to limit goodness and mercy to a *part;* to be willing that *many* should *perish*,---and *unwilling* that *all* should come to repentance,---to make a distinction in, and favour a *part* as good in contradistinction to others, and do them evil,---to contend for the victory of death over man, and by our declarations, manifest our *desire* for the miseries of thousands,---in fine, to be *sparing* of mercy and compassion, and *willing* to grieve and afflict the children of men! We tender thee, this *mirror*, Friend Dean,and we assure thee it will never flatter thee on the one hand, nor disfigure thy countenance on the other; but will show thee to thyself as *thou art.* Friend Dean says, "I see not how they will be changed after death, without the operation of Christ's Spirit," &c. We inform him, that the scriptures are explicit that there will be a change *after* death. See 1 Ephes. John iii. 2. "Beloved *now* are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we *shall be;* (we are to be changed) but we know that when he shall appear, we shall *be* like him; for we shall see him as he is." 1 Cor. xv. 51. "Behold, I show you a mystery, We shall *not* all sleep, but we shall *all be changed.* Verse 53. For this corruption must put on incorruption, and this mortal immortality." (not annihilation!) We likewise, inform Friend Dean, that we should have been better pleased, had his delicacy been differently exercised; and "called the Editor a *wizard* in plain terms," instead of through him indirectly, *directly* applying it to *Christ!* For we assure him that we are more jealous of the *name* and character of our Lord and Saviour, than we are of our *own!* And we think this savours too much of the spirit of the devil, which moved the ancient Pharisees to charge our Lord with "casting out devils by the power of Beelzebub, the prince of devils," to let pass without this *merited* animadversion!

We conclude with the remark, that true *philosophy* and *religion* are twin sisters; and walk hand in hand. But a spirit of *infidelity* and *opposition* to the truth, however dignified it may be with titles, will always prove a curse to the possessor, and entail upon him the full measure of disgrace and suffering, which it so justly merits!

Note.—We feel that some apology is due our Readers, for the length of our answers to Friend Dean's communications, which have occupied so much of our columns. And we assure them, that in future, unless he *directly* replies to our interrogatories, and attempts by candid investigation the confutation of our premises, by proof adduced from the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, we shall let them pass without notice or remark!

DISTINCTION IN FORM.

We consider *all* men as our *brethren;* but we do *not* consider their *errors*, as our *brethren;* neither shall we treat them as *such!*

Another sacrifice offered to Moloch.

A poor woman in the groves, last Saturday, attempted to cut her throat, under the painful conviction that she *could not be saved.* She had persuaded herself* that she was an object of Divine inexorable wrath, and her misery became so intolerable, that she resolved to end it by committing the dreadful act above stated. Although the wound was not necessarily mortal, she perished from loss of blood before timely assistance could be rendered, &c.

Rockingham Gazette.

* That is, she was persuaded by *Calvinists!* So much for the 'accursed *Shasters*' of America!

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. C. is received, and shall be published, &c.

ERRATA.

In our last Number, p. 158. 3 col. 24th line from the top, for '*we aught know*,' read for *aught we know.*

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 27, 1821. NO. 41

Communications.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR,—By giving an exposition of the following verses, of the 21st chapter of the Revelations, you will much oblige a subscriber. Verse 7th and 8th. "He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, *shall* have their part in the *lake* which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second *death*." A desire to obtain *truth* has induced me to address this to you, in the hope of obtaining it.

Your's, &c.

J. P. M.*****

REVELATION XXI. 7, 8.

"*He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death.*"

In order to a correct understanding of the subject offered for our consideration, it is necessary, first, to inquire the *time* when the things spoken of shall happen. Second, What is it to *overcome*; which necessarily introduces the inquiry, What is *that*, which is to be *overcome*? Third. Who are those who do *not overcome*? And these of necessity are those, who 'have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, *which is the second death!*' It is proper, however, to observe, that it is not declared, that all who *have* (in the past tense) been afraid, and not believed, and have worked abominations, and committed murder, and been whoremongers, and sorcerers, and guilty of idolatry, and told falsehoods, that they *should* (in the future tense) 'have their part in the lake,' &c! It is common to consider the 8th verse, as a schedule of all vices; and that all who have not overcome the temptation to commit any, and all of them, shall be endlessly miserable. We shall for a moment take it for granted this is truth, and reason accordingly. But we shall premise, however, that it does not say, that those who *have* (in the past tense) committed some, or all of these sins, and *repented*, that they shall 'inherit all things!' According to this view of the subject, who, we ask, can be saved? And who in our day, will presume to exalt themselves above the patriarchs and prophets of old? And where is the consistency of those, who will at one time praise with their mouth the goodness of these ancient servants of the Lord, and at another, damn them for ever with their premises and conclusions? Shall the 'fearful and unbelieving' be damned? See Jonah fleeing from the presence of the Lord, and refusing to obey his voice, or believe in him! And the 'Abominable,' who are these? Are they those who *hate* their fellows, or are they those who are hated *by* them? The former is the only true definition of the word! Is there a sect in our day, who boast of a disposition which not only hates, but if we can *believe* them, will actually dispose them to *rejoice and sing with joy*, when they shall behold the *misery* of their *dearest relations!* We verily believe, that it was left for the disciples of Calvin and Hopkins, to personate this character and define the word in all its extensive, and to them disgraceful meaning! Shall they be endlessly miserable? Heaven forbid! God grant they may receive better from his hands, than they award to their 'dearest friends, relatives and connexions!!!' Shall interminable wretchedness be the portion of every one who has been guilty of the crime of murder, or who has been a whoremonger, or unchaste? See David, Israel's king, guilty of the complicated crimes of murder and adultery! And righteous Lot, drunk with wine, and black with incest! Shall idolaters be cast off for ever? Then Solomon, the wisest of the wise, of whom God declared, that he 'would not take his loving-kindness utterly away, nor suffer his faithfulness to fail,' will be an outcast! Shall *all* liars be doomed to fire? Then all men who have arrived to mature years, must burn for ever! It is evident from only a superficial view of the subject, that our sticklers for endless misery must consent to a compromise, or qualification of the terms, to *save themselves!* Now, we shall consent to no compromise, or qualification, but the definition which God has given; which is our present inquiry. First of the time referred to. In chap. xxii. and at the 10th and 12th verses, it is declared, 'the *time* is at hand. And behold, I come *quickly*, and my reward *is* with me to give every man according as his work shall be.' This was spoken about 1800 years ago. We believe Christ came, and is still present, dispensing in his Mediatorial kingdom to every man according to *his* (the man's) works. And we believe with Paul, 'that they who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality; eternal life.' And we believe that no others have eternal life! And we farther believe, that the eternal life here spoken of, is the knowledge in this life, which produces faith in God, and joy in the Holy Ghost. And that the reverse of this, namely—contention, and a denial of the truth, (the salvation of all men) and obeying unrighteousness, (advocating the righteousness of the creature, or obeying the unrighteousness of those, who represent God as partial, and unjust) will produce tribulation in the mind, and fears of the wrath of God! We, therefore, believe, that the time was *then*, (1800 years ago,) at hand. And that Christ came (in the past tense) quickly. We have recently in our 37th Number, considered the New Jerusalem here spoken of, as figurative of the gospel church state, &c., into which believers enter.

The 4th verse of this chapter, is descriptive of those, and their peace, who have overcome, which is our second proposition, to inquire what it is *to* overcome, &c. The state, condition, and sufferings of those who have *not* overcome, is explanatory of the question. On them the *second* death has power! The question naturally presents itself—How many deaths are there? Now our Divine Doctors contend, that there are *three!* First—*spiritual*. Second—*temporal* [the body.] Third—*eternal!* But to preserve their consistency, they are obliged occasionally to be a *little* inconsistent, and make the *second* death mentioned in this chapter, answer all their purposes! The death of the body is a 'war, in which there is no discharge!' Consequently, this, *their* second death, they are obliged to take themselves, and submit patiently! We now ask them to produce their *third* death. We are of opinion, that they must 'obey a great deal of unrighteousness,' [and in that case they will 'have their part,' &c.] to prove that they are right, and the 'voice from heaven' wrong! We tell all the Calvinists and Arminians in creation, that *their third* death cannot be found in the scriptures, and no where else, except in *their* systems, sermons, and imaginations! The *last* death spoken of in the scriptures which man can suffer, is the *second* death. But the *third*, and emphatically the *last* death, is the death of *death* See 1 Cor. xv. 26. 'The last enemy *shall* be destroyed—death.' We believe there is only truth and error. Consequently, all who are opposed to salvation, *Universal*, and *Unconditional* in Christ, are *anti*, opposed to, and Antichrists! The second death, is referred to in chap. xiv. 10, 11. and it is declared, 'The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest *day* nor *night*, who worship the beast and his image.' We have no hesitation in saying, that the beast emphatically designates all Antichristian professors, and includes the church of Rome, and the Calvinistic heresy, which is the successor to, although in appearance opposed to the beast. It is well known that the doctrine of the beast, that there could be no salvation out of the pale of that church, [the kingdom of the beast,] was incorporated by Calvin and his adherents, into their creed, and damnation was damnation still; the principle only altered to damn all that did not belong to Calvin's church, which he designated as the *elect*, whether *infants* at the breast, or adults drooping with age! And the world have wondered to see a beast [a monster] grow in Calvinism, as fast as the other beast died, or decreased in the person of the popes! There are numbers who have been deluded with the errors of Calvinism, and who have *overcome*, and now inherit all things in Christ, being the 'sons of God, and joint heirs with Christ,' who have declared, that 'the smoke of their torments ascended up' from the commencement, to the end of their delusion, and that they 'had no rest, day nor night;' but that the *second* death had power on them, having no certain proof of their election, according to Calvin's creed, 'but a fearful looking for of fiery indignation!' And the *image* of this beast, correctly, and figuratively speaking, the *image*, because in effect producing the same misery and uncertainty--Arminianism, which is opposed to Christ, and contending for the righteousness of the creature in opposition to him, until *overcome*, subjects all who are deluded by it to the *second death!* The seven angels having vials filled with the *last* plagues, [and" there will be no more plagues after these!] poured them out upon Antichristian worshippers; but that poured out upon the seat of the beast the doctrine of partial decrees, and reprobation of millions, is the most remarkable, See XVI. 10 and 11. 'And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; [a *seat*, is that on which a person sits, or reposes. Calvinists repose upon partial decrees, election of a part, and reprobation of the remainder] and his kingdom was full of darkness, (what can be darker, or more uncertain than the kingdom, or hopes of a Calvinist? And what so *light*, and certain, as the oath of God, "that in Christ all the families of the earth shall be blessed"?) and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven, *because* of *their* pains, and their sores; and repented not of their deeds.' What is the *pain* of a partialist, who limits the mercy of God? Ans. Tormenting fear, lest he should be one of the non-elect! What are their *sores*? Ans. The falsehoods in their doctrine! How do they blaspheme God, *because* of their *pains*? Ans. Because they attribute to him designs and purposes, which would disgrace the devil, the adversary of God and man; and this is emphatically done *because* of their *pains*, as though God by being told by them of the glory of his justice in damning their neighbour, would induce him to give them evidence that he would save them! And the '*disinterested benevolence*' preached by them, is well commented on, when they declare, that they shall rejoice and sing with joy, to witness the miseries of their *children* and dearest connexions in hell-fire for ever!!! Here is the beast, or his image, beware how you receive his mark in 'your hand, or forehead!'

If it is objected, Where is your evidence of this? Prove that the church of Rome, or Calvin's, or Arminius' church, is designated in the passages mentioned? We answer—The language is figurative. If taken literally, it has nothing to do with

men. In introducing our *third* proposition—'Who are those who do not overcome,' we remarked, that 'these of necessity, are those who 'have their part in the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death.' It therefore follows of necessity, that all who worship the *beast*, have their part in the lake, &c.; and all who have *their part* in the *lake*, &c. are *those* who worship the beast, &c. We, therefore, have taken the only ground which can be taken; for there is no other rule by which we can understand the Apocalypse—nay, more—this is the rule there laid down! How, we ask, shall any man understand, or profit by this *book*, and avoid 'worshipping the beast and his image,' if the beast and his image cannot be *identified*? It is well known that commentators of different ages have given 500 *identities* to the beast, or, in other words, applied, and declared the application of the beast to 500 different persons, powers, nations, sects, or principalities! We say, there can be only *truth*, and *error*. 'Christ is the way, the *truth*, and the life.' Whatever is opposed to Christ, is *anti!* We can illustrate this by a simile common among men, and of acknowledged authority in all courts of justice. Let it be recollected, first, however, that all who prefer any claims to the name, or character of Christian, come under one of the *three* following characters, namely,—Calvinists, Arminians, or Universalists, (believers in God's promise made to Abraham,) and it is impossible to find one among the many sects in *name*, which exist in the world, which do not fall under one of these *three* great divisions. Now, we ask, who, and which of these *three*, are they, whose '*tears are wiped away*'—with whom there is *no more death*—neither *sorrow, nor crying*, nor *pain*?' With whom are the *former* things *passed away*? Reader, they are those, on whom the *second death* has no power! For, it is *fear of* the *second* death, which produces the '*tears, sorrow, crying*, and pain!' We likewise, ask, Who are those who *fear* a '*second* death,' and '*sorrow*, and *cry*,' and experience 'pain' in consequence of their fears? We answer, Every believer in Calvin's doctrine of election and reprobation! Every believer in a *conditional* salvation! And well may they fear. They cannot produce any evidence of their *election*, or salvation being sure to them on account of their performance of *conditions*—for the man who 'trusteth in his own heart is a fool!' Prov xxviii. 26. See Jer xvii. 5. Now, look at our evidence, and apply it. If a man is found with stolen goods in his possession, he is considered a thief, unless he can account for his obtaning them lawfully! Now put the question—Who are in possession of the *fears*, the unbelief, the sorrow, tears, and pain? Where did you get them? Did they proceed from your '*overcoming*,' and do you *inherit all things*? If so, why do you *cry*? What are you *afraid* of? Paul told the Jailer, 'Believe! and thou shalt be saved, and thine house!' Do you *believe*? Have you overcome? And do you inherit all things? If so, why do you say, that your brethren, the heathen, are lost, and going for ever into misery? Paul said, 'Rejoice evermore!' Who are the '*fearful and unbelieving*,' but those who are afraid to trust God, and disbelieve his gospel which he preached to Abraham, saying, In thy seed (Christ) shall *all the families* of the earth be *blessed*? Who are the '*abominable*,' but those who sound the *loud amen* to the *misery* of their *dearest* relations and friends? Who are the '*murderers*,' buta those who *hate* their *brethren* of the human race, and *consign* them to interminable wretchedness? Who are the whoremongers, (spiritual adulterers) but those who depart from the worship and service of the true God, and join themselves to the traditions of men, and the gods of their creation? Who are the '*sorcerers*,' but those who offer *incense* to strange gods, and by their *divining*, pretend to the power and authority of judging to hell, by *their* knowledge of the future, in which they describe all the *arcana* of Pluto's regions, and *measure* the merits, and by their conjuration, pronounce the reprobation, and set their seal to the damnation of others! Who are the '*idolaters*,' but those who worship gods who *cannot*, or *will not* save? And who, we ask, are the '*liars*,' but they who *deny* that 'God is the Saviour of all men;' and that 'all nations whom he hath made, shall come and worship before him and glorify his name?' These all 'have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death!' It is remarkable, that those only suffer, and that 'the smoke of their torments (only) ascendeth up from *age* to *age*, (from *aionion* to *aionion*) who worship the beast and his image,' and that they, alone, 'have no rest *day* nor *night*,' because they consign their brethren, whom they suppose their beast does not like so well as themselves, to '*fire and brimstone!*' With what peculiar emphasis does the words of inspiration apply to them---'For, if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.' In other words, if you will not forgive others, you shall not have a consciousness of being forgiven yourselves! Again, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment *ye judge*, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again!' If *you* judge your brother to *fire and brimstone*, you shall have this fire and brimstone judged to you again! The disposition which influences you to judge your brother to *fire*, shall be your torment; and your foreboding the same misery you meted to your brother, shall punish you! Here is the justice of our GOD! He has *justice*, as well as *mercy!* No longer let scoffers and scorners say, your 'God is a God all mercy, and a God unjust.' We appeal to their own feelings, to their *fears and torment*, the consequence of their unbelief and idolatry, and their assumption of his Divine prerogative, for they, in the language of the Poet, would

'Re-judge his justice, and be God of God!'

'For whoso is born of God *overcometh* the world:' And this is the victory that *overcometh* the world, *our faith!*' 1 John v. 4. What are we to believe? Let John answer---'He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself, (he is in possession of evidence which is certain and satisfactory---partial decrees, or conditions, have no part nor lot in the matter,) he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And *this is the record*, that God hath *given* to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son,' (v. 10, 11.) This is the faith which *overcometh*, and none who are in possession of it, 'are hurt by the *second* death.' The chapter containing the passage under consideration, we consider parallel with Isaiah lxv. particularly from the 17th verse to the close. In our 8th Number, page 30, the new creation [regeneration] in Christ is considered. And the reader, by comparing these two chapters, will be satisfied of their connexion, &c. The new heaven, therefore, is the gospel church state, in contradistinction to the Jewish church, which is the old heaven. The old earth was the Jews. The new earth all men, made *one in Christ*, the Head! And the declaration, 'and there was no more *sea*,' is further explanatory; the Gentiles, all *the* nations in contradistinction to the Jews, are designated by the *sea*. See xii. 12. 'Wo to the inhabiters of the *earth* (Jews) and of the *sea*,' (Gentiles) xiii. 1. 'And I saw a beast rise up out of the *sea*.' (From among the *Gentiles!*) Therefore, the *first heaven*, [Jewish church] and the *first earth* (the nation of the Jews) are passed away, and there is no more *sea*, [Gentiles] for *all* are made *one* in Christ! If this is disputed, and it is said the old heaven and earth, and sea remains, we answer, [see 5th and 6th verses] and he that sat upon the throne, said, Behold, I make all things new. (Not man. There are no conditions here. It is not a part, but *all!*) And he said unto me, Write;---(It is *done*, already, proclaim it!) for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me---*It is done!*' All who *overcome* the world: in other words---All who overcome the traditions of men, and the delusions of the adversary, and believe God, that he is mighty to save, and has brought salvation, and secured it in Christ 'without money, and without price, receive of the water of life freely.' (not conditionally.) On the other hand, all who fear to trust God, &c., and trust to their own works, and all unbelievers in the Universal and Unconditional salvation of God, are cast into the lake of fire; terrified by apprehensions that a God who *cannot*, or will *not* save, *cannot* or *will* not save *them!* 'This is the *second* death.' But '*we* who have *believed* do *enter* into *rest!!!*'

FREEDOM OF THE PULPIT.

When the "*liberty of the press*" is so ably advocated, and its supporters are so numerous, it may to some seem strange, that so few should plead for the *freedom of the pulpit*. This may appear more surprising, when it is considered, that the press makes an impression on paper, and the pulpit on the air; and consequently, is soon obliterated and forgotten. We are led into this train of thought from the present disagreement between the Unitarians and Calvinists, or Hopkinsians in this city, occasioned by the Reverend Doctor Gardiner Spring's refusal to comply with a request to have his sermon printed, which was recently delivered before the descendants of the "*Pilgrims who first landed at Plymouth;*" and which was *expected* to have commemorated this event, &c. It appears the "Reverend Doctor," instead of treating his audience with gratulations, and by a regular and gentle gradation coming down upon them with the praise of their ancestors, he abruptly changed his *tone;* and from praising the great grandfathers as *heroes* in religion, stigmatized their descendants as *pigmies* in *wickedness!* As we did not hear the sermon delivered, and have only seen a few sentences which are published with remarks, &c. we are obliged to have recourse to conjecture, and to suppose what a truly pious divine uncontaminated with the guilt of his "*puny*" associates, and inspired with the wisdom and devotion of these ancient heroes, would say on this occasion. And understanding that the degeneracy of the *clergy*, as well as the laity, was spoken of, we presume that the contrast was in no particular more manifest, or so much the subject of animadversion, as the *large salaries*, and *extravagant living* of the clergymen of our day, many of whom receive a greater sum for *one* month's PREACHING, than the ancient divines received for a whole *year's labour!* And when it is considered that the 'love of money is the root of all evil,' the cause of this degeneracy is at once manifest. Now, if this is the offensive part which has given umbrage to so many, 'surely the reverend gentleman has a solace in his *own* rectitude, in the conviction, that *his example*, at least in this particular, is a *good comment* upon his *precept!*

It is a great pity that there is so much jarring and discord in the religious world. Surely, if the Unitarians considered the inconveniences which sometimes attend the publishing of a sermon, that it is sending into a censorious world a book, and that the sentiments and doctrines inculcated in it, are by a strange conclusion considered as the property of every one who may possess it, and who feel themselves privileged to think for themselves, and make such remarks, and draw conclusions agreeably to their *own* views, opinions, and principles—if these considerations are admitted, and the '*stern*' manners and independence of the *ancient* clergymen adverted to, who can blame the reverend doctor? Shall not a man have liberty to *imitate* what he *admires*? And who, we ask, in the good old times referred to, when charity, forbearance, and freedom of opinion in religious matters, those sterling Christian virtues, were so much practised,—who in those days, would have presumed to dictate to, or question the judgment, or arraign the motives or manner of a clergyman? It would have required '*sterner stuff*' than is possessed by their 'puny descendants' to have even imagined the thing, much more to have attempted it!

Now we make these remarks, as noting the passing events of the day in the religious world; and should posterity be so fortunate as to obtain this Number of the 'G. Herald,' they will learn with satisfaction that the spirit of the primitive New-England clergy was not wholly extinct in our day! For ourselves, in this particular, however, we are but '*lookers on.*' We consider the Calvinists, and Arminians, as the two great Belligerents in the militant religious world. Although like all *neutrals* we are occasionally disposed by circumstances to a skirmish with both parties, still we have no alliance with either. We wish them success; but in nothing less than their religious battles; for experience has proved, that defeat on one side, has been the prelude to oppression on the other.

Did mankind make allowance for circumstances

when they are judging, and admit that, which their *own* conduct *proves* without the least courtesy to their *professions*, they would then acknowledge the presumption, at least, that many of the primitive New-England clergymen, had they lived in the present day, would have received without much persuasion a large salary, and accommodated themselves to the *inconveniences* of a fashionable and luxurious life, to please their congregations; and on the other hand, perhaps some of the degenerate clergymen of the present day, had it been their good fortune to have lived in the good old times of their pious ancestors, would have been composed of the same '*stern stuff*' they were—possessed their extraordinary virtues and holiness, and hung for witches, and wizards, all who dared to think for themselves, or doubt their supremacy!

Controversial.

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR,—I am very far from supposing that a free and unrestricted disquisition is by any means prejudicial to truth; but in order to find the truth, we should fairly and impartially investigate the subject of controversy, and not conceive that by *ribaldry* and *sarcasms*, to triumph over our opponents. And surely when a subject which involves our interest (particularly our eternal) is the subject of debate, our inquiry ought to be circumspect and scrutinizing. Doubtless by this obtrusion of my thoughts in the Gospel Herald, I shall obtain a share of these epithets, that you so lavishly heap upon the sect to which I profess to belong; but be it as it may, I will venture a few ideas that suggested themselves to my mind on the perusal of a piece in your paper, (No. 34.) headed Methodism, alias Antichrist, which appears to be a review of a Methodist Tract, No. 2, on the necessity and nature of true repentance.

The first paragraph that meets the eye of your criticism, is the assertion made by the author of the Tract that the glory of heaven is offered a free gift, and that in order to *obtain* this *free gift* the sinner must *repent* or be lost for ever, and then start a quere, 'Would a Methodist reason thus, if his *money* depended upon the fair construction of the words he used'—and immediately rejoin, 'We think not. Can any thing be given that is never received? No!' But as the quere is started, I think I have a right to answer. I think they would, if they reasoned concurrent with common sense. For if any thing is proffered as a *free gift*, we must *obtain* it or *not* have it.

'Can any thing be given that is not received?' You say, no! Well, Mr. Editor, did you ever hear a Methodist say it could? Why, Mr. Editor, I believe there is Methodists that know as well as other people, that two and two make four; and also know there is a difference between a thing being *offered*, and a thing being *obtained*. A thing being in the *possession* of another, and a thing being in our own possession. Between salvation purchased *for* us, and salvation enjoyed *by* us. You say, that repentance is described by the Tract, to consist in earnest attendance on the preaching of the gospel, meetings for prayer and social worship, &c., which you know to be a wilful misconstruction of the author's words. These are his words—'Repentance *produces* (not consists in) earnest prayers to God through our *Lord Jesus Christ*. Daily, especially in secret, and also in the various means of supplication afforded by our heavenly Father in his wise Providence; and also *diligent searching the Scriptures*; (which you recommend to the Methodists) then comes in your quotation, earnest attendance on the preaching of the gospel, meetings for prayer, and social worship, &c

The next thing you take notice of, is, the design of God being defeated, and cry out, 'Shame on such impious conclusions.' Why, if *man has not power to counteract the design of God*, it follows of course, that he is nothing but a passive engine; for he does not what he *would*, but what he *must*; all his acts are determined by the power of God. Therefore, he is no more master of his actions, than he is of his being, and of course, all the merit or demerit of his actions devolve upon God. Now, Mr. Editor, this is not an impious, but an inevitable conclusion that must result from the premises; and if we cannot defeat the design of God, whatever God designs we perform, and nothing that he designs we can help performing; therefore, the epithet of Antichrist that you apply to us, is nothing but an absurdity; for Antichrist signifies an adversary, an opposer or contrary to Christ, who you acknowledge to be God.

Therefore, according to my conception of things, your account stands thus; you believe that the design of God cannot be opposed, and these Methodist heretics oppose the design of God. You next think, that 'if these perverters of the scriptures would examine their Bibles, they would find that repentance itself is given. It is as much a gift as the air we breathe, or the rain that falls.' And further on, you say, that 'the word repentance is but little understood; it is a *consequence*, not a *cause* of salvation. A man *repents* whenever he changes his mind, let the subject be what it may; it is *turning*.' Now, this and the above appear to me to be of a piece. It reads thus—The *man repents*, God gives him *repentance*—it is *turning*—God gives him *turning*. You quote to substantiate the idea, you advance Acts v. 31. I presume it will be seen to apply it in this way, that it conveys no meaning at all. And our idea of this repentance, is this,—and it appears to be the only way that WE can make it concur with sense, that through the exaltation of Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost is given, which reproves the world of sin, of righteousness, and judgment, and this excites to repentance; (the act is the man's) the excitement is the gift, as well as the forgiveness of sins.

I know not why you should challenge us to prove that Christ is a changeable being, when there never was such a thing advanced by the Methodists; for on his immutability all our calculations are made. I am not to advocate the precise manner of choosing words, but I presume the author means the *same* as *Paul*. Rom. ii. 9, 11, 12, 16 'Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile.' For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law; in the *day* when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus, according to my gospel.' And in the next place, you break out in a strain of indignity against the Methodists for unprovoked and *damnable* slander uttered against the Saviour of the world. Now, Mr. Editor, you seem as if you were resolved to deal in contradictions. First, pronounce the thing *damnable*, and as such is to be answered for to the Saviour of the world. Now, if this Judge must be the Saviour of the world, how can any thing be damnable, or is the crime to be damned, and the perpetrator cleared? If so, this Judge and Saviour of the world must be like the log that Jupiter gave the frogs for a king; virtuous and vicious alike immaterial to him, whether *blasphemy, slander*, or any thing else; and in the next place, as if to contradict yourself for calling him *Judge*, you quote his words, 'If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world but to save the world.' In the next place you say, 'God is love;' (this many a Methodist has experienced) and the God of love speaking by his prophet says, 'I am God, I change not. You want to compare this with the Tract. Well, this I have done, and the result of the comparison is, that God being love, induced him to send his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life. And his immutability is the reason, that only by repentance toward God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, salvation can be experienced. Hence the necessity, and the importance of repentance. But as to following the Lord, or Antichrist, I presume that you do not forget that just above you have been exploding the doctrine of *defeating* the design of God. And now are you going to give us the privilege of following God or Antichrist, as we choose, without any reference to the design of God?

The next thing I observe, is your metamorphose of the meaning of *trusted, turning*, and *repented*, to make the import of the same meaning. There is no use of commenting on the conclusion of the piece, for we believe that 'all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him.' For the earth is the Lord's and he is the Governor among the nations.' Then, not only Methodist heresy, but all heresy, error and falsehood, will be annihilated, and death and the grave destroyed. With you, looking for this blessed hope, we say, Come Lord Jesus, come quickly.

A METHODIST.

P. S. I have used the word *grave*, in the stead of *hell*, as I have heard those of your creed say, that they are synonymous.

REMARKS.

We are constrained to believe, that if the 'Gospel Herald,' instead of bringing '*Good* tidings of *great* joy, which shall be to *all* people,' proclaimed *bad* tidings of *great* grief, which should be to almost *all* people, or that the *good* tidings were to, or for only a *few*, a *part*, or *some* of *all*, our language would be considered like the *cooing* of the *dove*, or the summer *zephyr whispering* through the trees! We have said, and we repeat it—We have no *desire* to offend. But if the *truth* will *offend*—we must, and shall offend. In fine, we prefer the *truth* to every thing which can be imagined, or named; and we freely acknowledge, that we are not endowed with the qualification to treat the *truth* in an ambiguous manner, and leave to the *courtesy* of the reader, the liberty to pronounce it to be whatever he *pleases!* We are induced to make these remarks from the disposition manifested by our Methodist friend, who, we think, is under the influence of his prejudices; or he would not, either directly, or indirectly, charge us with making use of '*ribaldry*' in our expressions. We have that charity for him to believe, that if he had been acquainted with the meaning of the word, he would not have applied it to us. When, we ask, did we make use of '*mean, lewd*, and *brutal* language,' in answer to any of our correspondents? Relative to '*Sarcastic*' language, we shall, whenever opportunity offers, '*keenly reproach*,' or '*censure* as *criminal*,' gross errors, which rob a Saviour of his glory, and consign to interminable wretchedness our brethren of the human family! His remark, that 'our inquiries ought to be circumspect, and *scrutinizing*,' we agree with; and hope he will not be offended at our '*scrutinizing*' his communication. And we likewise assure him, that he will receive '*his share*' of the '*epithets*' which we 'lavish' upon others!

Our correspondent in his second paragraph, quotes from our remarks on the Methodist Tract, Number 2, and considers that common sense teaches, that 'if any thing is proffered as a *free* gift, we must *obtain* it, or not *have* it.' What does common sense teach when we talk of *conditions*, which are not *free* gifts? If a man has an article to *sell*, you 'must *obtain* it, or not *have* it!' Is there no difference between a bargain, or *sale*, and a *free gift*? Let common sense decide! Suppose a man gave you a house, *freely*, without asking or solicitation? it would then, be a *free* gift, for you would *be* put (not *put* yourself) in possession of it. Your neighbour interrogates you—What did you *pay* for your house? You answer, nothing! How, then, did you get it, what *did* you for it? What consideration did you make the person from whom you received it? Why, I *obtained* it! Then you received your house, in consideration of something you done, you say, *you* obtained (*procured*) it? No, it was a *free gift*. Then you received it without any consideration whatever. No. For I could never have it, if *I* had not obtained *it!* We again say, let common sense decide!

Our correspondent in his third paragraph, acknowledges that there is a '*difference* between a thing being *offered*, and a thing being *obtained*.' Where is the *difference*? He continues—'A thing being in the possession of *another*, and a thing being in *our* own *possession*.' Now for the *free gift!* A man *gives* you a house, but keeps the house in his

own possession! A man *sells* you a house, and you *obtain* it by complying with his conditions, *paying* for it! Our correspondent adds—'Between salvation *purchased* for us, and salvation enjoyed *by us*.' Now, we ask, what is the difference? Ans. A father may *purchase* an inheritance for his son, and record the *gift* in his last *will* and *testament*, and die, and the son come into *possession* of the inheritance by law, and justice, (he being the only right owner and proprietor of it, and at the same time know nothing about it; consequently, not *enjoy* it. Now the difference in this case, is all this—one man purchases a piece of beef for another, and the person for whom he purchases the *beef* does not *enjoy* it, until he *eats* it! But, if the person was to purchase a piece of beef for *another*, and *eat it himself*, we think the *other* would never *enjoy* it! And farther, we think the circumstance of the man's eating the beef *himself*, would prove, if common sense is allowed to decide, that he bought the beef *for* himself! What is the meaning of the word *gift*? Ans. A thing '*bestowed*.' Can you *bestow* a thing upon another, and at the same time keep it in your own possession? And if you declare the gift is *free*, does the word *free* imply a something to *be* done to induce you to *bestow* the thing? In the phraseology of the Methodist tract, we say, there are provisions offered you at the Fly, and Washington Markets, a *free gift;* as sure, as thou art a descendant of Adam, these provisions are offered thee, to *obtain* which, thou must assuredly pay the *cash* for them, or *starve!* Our correspondent says of our quotation from the tract in question, that it is a '*wilful misconstruction*.' That the words of the tract are, 'Repentance *produces*, not *consists* in,' &c. Our readers by looking at the tract will read as follows—'Repentance then is first---A heart-rending grief, &c. Second---True repentance is accompanied with an ardent desire and determination to flee from the wrath to come, &c. Third---Repentance produces earnest prayer,' &c. Pray, where is our '*wilful* misconstruction.' It is declared, 'Repentance then IS first---Supposing we had quoted only these words, and added the *et cetera*, (&c.,) and our correspondent had come forward with the declaration, 'These are the words, Repentance *produces*, not consists in,' How would his allegation have appeared? How does it appear now? We made an extract from the *third* division, from under a *general head!* It was headed in language perfectly synonymous with that we made use of. We added the &c. to inform the reader we had only copied a *part*, and we did quote *that* part, which contains in *substance* all that the tract contains on the subject! The language of the tract is, 'Repentance then, *is*,' &c. Ours—Repentance *consists in*. We leave it to common sense, and our Methodist Friend, to decide, and he may select for himself,—he may choose, whether he will have it that repentance *is*, or that repentance '*consists in!*' And farther—If the repentance spoken of in the tract, '*produces*' something different from what it *is*, and if that in which it *consists*, is so very *different* from what it *is*, that nothing short of '*wilful misconstruction*' could represent, or imply any *analogy* between them, then, we plead guilty to the charge; and not without!

Our correspondent in his *fifth* paragraph, says, 'The next thing you take notice of, is, the design of God being *defeated*, and cry out, Shame on such impious conclusions!' And *he* adds, 'Why, *if man has not power to defeat the design of God*, it follows of course, that he is nothing but a passive *engine;* for he does not what he *would*, but what he *must;* all his acts are determined by the power of God. Therefore, he is no more master of his *actions*, than he is of his *being*, and of course all the *merit*, or demerit of his actions devolve upon God.' We shall take the liberty to '*scrutinize*' this. We, however, will gratify our Methodist Friend for a moment, and supposing his hypothesis to be true, that we *can* 'defeat the designs of God,' reason accordingly. Now our Methodist Friend believes, that it is the *design* of God, to make what he (or his sect) calls finally impenitent sinners miserable for ever. But these sinners *can defeat* the design of God, consequently, they will *not* be miserable for ever! Why? Ans. They will not *let* God's design be accomplished! Now, we verily think, if common sense is allowed to decide, this of all designs, is the one which it would be most for the interest of sinners to circumvent! Does our Methodist Friend object, and say, that the sinner *cannot* defeat this. God's design? We answer—then 'it follows of course, that he is nothing but a passive engine, for he does *not* what he *would*, but what he must. All his acts are determined by the *power* of God!' We ask our Methodist Friend, How do you like *your* premises now? Will you pretend to say, that God *can* be defeated in *one* design, and *not* in another? Or if God can be defeated in *any* of his designs, that this (*if* this is his) design, is *not* the one? If so, then, we say, *prove it!* Again We ask our Methodist Friend—Can you defeat the design of the President of the United States, (he being privy to your intention, and you will acknowledge that God knows all things) if not, 'it follows of course, that you are nothing but a passive *engine*, for you do not do, what you would, but what you must!' Now it is *our design* to confute your hypothesis, and prove your premises to be a gross *absurdity*, and 'it follows of course, if you cannot controvert our design, that you are an *engine!*' We stop, however, for we should not like to be accountable for all your actions, which according to your conclusions must 'devolve upon' us! Our Methodist Friend, professing to receive the scriptures as authority paramount to all other, we shall try his hypothesis by them, and leave the whole to the candour of our readers. Dan. iv. 35. 'And all the inhabitants of the earth *are* reputed as nothing, and he doeth his will in the army of heaven, and *among* the inhabitants of the earth; and *none* can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?' Acts xvii. 28. 'For *in* him we live, and move, and have our being.' Isaiah xlvi. 10. 'Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times, that are not yet done, saying, My counsel *shall stand*, and I will do *all* my pleasure.' Quere. What is the pleasure of God? Ans. 'Say unto them, *As* I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his ways and live.' Ezek. xxxiii. 11. God, therefore, has *no* pleasure in the death of the wicked; but he *has* pleasure in his turning, and living! Will all the wicked turn? Ans. 'All the ends of the world shall remember and *turn* unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him.' Psalm xxii. 27. God has no design, or pleasure, in the misery or suffering of any of the human race in a future state of existence. He declares, all '*shall turn and live!*' Who, we ask, except the devil, can possess a disposition to *defeat* or *controvert* this pleasure, or design of God? We answer---none but the devil, or those instigated by him. Christ was manifested to destroy the devil and his works; and he will accomplish the end for which he came, and God be all in all! See Matt. xxviii. 18. 'All power is given to me in heaven and earth.' We ask, if Christ has *all* power, where is the power to defeat him? Rom. xiii. 1. 'For there is *no power* but *of* God!' Quere. Where, then, is the power to defeat God? Psalm cx. 3. 'Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power.' Willing to do what? To defeat God? No! To worship him! We think it unnecessary to quote more passages; either of those adduced is sufficient to turn our Methodist Friend's hypothesis upside down! God is Almighty; and of all absurdities, we pronounce that the greatest, which declares that a finite impotent creature, can defeat, or controvert the design of the Infinite, Omnipotent Jehovah. Of all the follies of Deism, in justice to the Deist, we declare, that we never heard a Deist advance so preposterous and ridiculously absurd a position! No never! So much for the traditions of men.

Our correspondent continues---'Now, Mr. Editor, this is not an impious, but an inevitable conclusion that must result from the premises; and if we cannot *defeat* the design of God, whatever God designs, we perform, and nothing that he designs we can help performing; therefore, the epithet of Antichrist that you apply to us, is nothing but an absurdity,' Please to read the second Psalm. 'Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing, &c? He that sitteth in the heaven shall laugh, the Lord shall have them in derision.' not (be defeated by them.) Yet (notwithstanding this) have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree, (who can defeat it?) The Lord hath said unto me, Thou my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give the heathen thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth thy possession.' Now, we ask, Is not here a 'case in point?' Were not these heathen, and the people who *raged* and *imagined* a *vain* thing, were not they *anti*, opposed to Christ, and did they defeat God, or were they defeated by him? This is unanswerable. Relative to *your* conclusions, we consider them of the same value with the premises, from which they were deduced! Our Methodist Friend, it seems, concluded that the term Antichrist was absurdly applied to his sect. (Why?) 'For Antichrist signifies an adversary, and opposer, or contrary to Christ, whom you acknowledge to be God.' Supposing a man with murder in his heart, were to meet you in the street, and attempt to take your life, would he be *anti*, opposed to you? According to your hypothesis, he would not, except he actually murdered you! Our correspondent cannot see the difference between *opposing*, and *defeating!*

Our Methodist Friend commences his fifth paragraph, with a *new* phraseology! He has exchanged the word *defeated* for *opposed;* or, in other words, he has taken it for granted they were synonymous terms, we presume, and reasoned accordingly. He says, 'Therefore, according to *my* conception of things, your account stands thus---you believe the design of God cannot be *opposed!* And those Methodist heretics *oppose* the design of God.' Reader, our account wants no auditor to prepare it for inspection. How stands the Methodist's account? And when, we ask, did we declare our belief, that the design of God could *not* be opposed? To oppose, and *defeat*, are two things. Our Methodist Friend is *opposing* us; and *we* are *defeating* him!!! Here is all the difference. And we entreat our Methodist Friend never again to tell of defeating the Omnipotent God, when he cannot *oppose* with success, even an impotent creature!

(To be Concluded next week.)

DEDICATION.

On the 10th instant the new brick Meeting House in Milford was solemnly dedicated to the worship of God. The order of service was as follows: Appropriate portions of Scripture were read by Br. Robert L. Killam. Introductory prayer by Br. Richard Carrique. Consecrating prayer by Br. Elias Smith. Sermon by Br. Hosea Ballou, from Isaiah ii. 3; "*And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.* Concluding prayer by Br. Zephania S. Crossman.

This house is a beautiful specimen of neat architecture, of sufficient dimension to accommodate the inhabitants of the town, has a good clock, and bell, together with an organ. The day of dedication was remarkably pleasant, the congregation uncommonly numerous, and the music on the occasion did honour to the refined taste of the numerous choir. A solemn joy seemed to be diffused through the whole congregation, occasioned by the fact that this house was built for, and devoted to the promotion of the doctrine of universal, impartial benevolence, and salvation by Jesus Christ our Lord.

Boston U. Magazine.

MARVELLOUS.

It was related in a late *Missionary talk*, that a 'large tribe in India invariably put to *death all* their *female* infants as soon as *born!*' Quere. Where do they obtain their *wives?* We think the relators of this abominable story, would do well to recollect the advice given to *great* story-tellers—'Always keep *probability* in view!'

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Gamma, and Humanity, are received, and will be published, &c.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1821. NO. 42.

Controversial.

ANSWER TO A METHODIST.

[*Concluded.*]

Our correspondent in answer to our definition of the word *repentance*, and to our quotation from the scriptures, which declare that repentance is *given*, &c. says, "The man repents, God gives him repentance;—it is turning, God gives him *turning*." And he is pleased to add, "You quote to substantiate the idea you advance, Acts v. 31. I presume it will be seen to apply it in this way, that it conveys no meaning at all." We are not surprised at this blunder, for our correspondent has proved his ignorance of the meaning of the word *give!* We request him to remember, that to *give* a thing, is to *bestow* it, &c. We ask our correspondent, whether repentance 'consists' in turning, or is '*produced*' by turning? He continues,—"Our idea of this repentance, is this, and it appears to be the only way that WE can make it concur with *sense*; that through the exaltation of Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost is *given*, which reproves the world of sin, of righteousness, and judgment, and this *excites* to repentance; (the act is the *man's*,) the excitement is the *gift*, as well as the forgiveness of sins." We ask, Is this the only understanding of the passage in question, which is agreeable to *sense*? Let us examine this *logic*. The Tract declares, "Without repentance thy soul will be ruined;—thine immortal soul will be for ever miserable in hell." And our correspondent declares, "the act is the man's!" And it seems that every thing which does not succumb to this, is devoid of *sense!* Reader, how are we saved, according to this view? Ans. We are saved by *repentance*, (from endless misery,) and the *act* is the *man's*; and our correspondent to show his consistency, acknowledges that "forgiveness of sins is a *gift!*" Is there any *sense* in Paul's declaration, (please to bear in mind, that our Methodist Friend will not admit that there is any *sense* in the declaration, that our sins are forgiven *before* we repent,) see Ephes. ii. 4, to 9th verses inclusive. "But God, who is *rich* in mercy, for his *great love* wherewith he loved *us*, EVEN WHEN WE WERE DEAD IN SINS, hath (in the *past* tense) quickened *us* together with Christ, by grace are ye saved (not by repentance) and hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus. That in the ages to come, he might show the exceeding riches of his grace (not the riches of our repentance, the "man's own act,") in *his* kindness towards us through Christ Jesus. For by grace (not repentance) are ye saved through faith, (not the man's own act) and *that* NOT of YOURSELVES, (Why? Where is the man's *own* act" now? Where is the *sense*? Ans.) It is the gift of God! *Not of works*, lest any man should boast." Where, now, we ask, is "the man's *own* act?" "Gone like the baseless fabric of a vision, and leaves not a wreck behind!" We request our correspondent, again to look at *his* premises. He says, "And our idea of this repentance is this, and it appears to be the only way that WE can make it concur with *sense*; that through the exaltation of Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost is given, which reproves the world of sin, &c, and *this* excites *to* repentance." Now hear Peter's *idea* of this matter.—"Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye *shall* (in the future tense, after you repent) receive the *gift* of the Holy Ghost." Our correspondent tries hard to make a distinction. He says, "the excitement is the *gift*, as well as the forgiveness of sins." See Acts v. 31. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, a Prince and a Saviour for to (do what? To give *excitement*? No!) give *repentance* to Israel, and forgiveness of sins! Now according to our ideas, we can make no *sense* of the passage, except we admit that repentance is as much a *gift* as the forgiveness of sins! Again,—Tim. ii. 2. "In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will *give* them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." What is this, but *turning* from lying vanities to the acknowledging of the truth, that "God is the Saviour of all men?" &c.

Our Methodist Friend appeared disposed to ridicule our definition of the word repentance to mean *turning*; and he, it seems, is of opinion, there is no *sense* in this view of it. Now we inform him, that whether there is *sense*, or not, there is much *truth!* Proof, Acts iii. 26. "Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you in *turning* away every one of you from his iniquities." Our correspondent believes none will be saved, but those who repent. We ask, supposing the man *turns* from all his iniquities, (unbelief is one) will he not be saved? If so, is not *turning* repentance? You must acknowledge, either that *turning* and repenting are the *same*, or that a man can be saved *without* repentance! And we consider that no other view of this subject is 'concurrent with *sense*.' But to put the question at rest, we refer him to Ezek. xviii. 22. "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the LORD GOD; and not that he should *return* and live!" Zech. ix. 12. "*Turn* ye to the strong hold ye prisoners of hope." Lam. v. 21. "*Turn* us unto thee, O Lord, and we shall be *turned*." Jonah iii. 8. "Let them *turn* every one from his evil way." Jer. xxxi. 18. "*Turn* thou me, and I shall be turned." Acts xxvi. 18. "To open their eyes, to *turn them* from darkness to light, and *from* the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is *in me*." (Christ, not the creature.)

Our correspondent's sixth paragraph, we are sorry to say, commences with a declaration which is not altogether agreeable to truth. What! Did the Methodists never advance such a thing as the declaration that Christ was a changeable being? Look at the Tract. 'A friend *now*, but *not* a sinner's *friend* in the great day of judgment!' We shall forbear any comment; it *speaks* for itself! We inform him that our sentiments are in perfect unison with Paul's, which he quoted. How the Author of the Tract could intend to express Paul's meaning, by declaring that a time was coming when Christ, who was *now* the sinner's friend, would *not* be his friend, must astonish every honest believer and reader of Paul's declarations, in this very Epistle from which your quotation is made. Paul declares, Rom. v. 8, 9. 'But God commendeth his *love* towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.' See viii. 38, 39. 'For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, (is the great day of judgment to come) nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to *separate* us from the *love* of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord!' We consider this Methodist declaration to be a *slander* against the Saviour, inexpressibly abominable. Wishing our correspondent to see things as they are, and let words have their proper signification, we advise him to look at his *own* criterion, and judge accordingly. Please to compare what you consider on our part, a 'wilful misconstruction,' with your author of the Tract, in his (as you '*presume*,') definition and application of the words of Paul! Rom. ii.

Our correspondent says, 'Now, Mr. Editor, you seem as if you were resolved to deal in contradictions. First pronounce the thing *damnable*, and as such is to be answered for to the Saviour of the world. Now, if this Judge must be the Saviour of the world, how can any thing be damnable? Or is the *crime* to be *damned* and the perpetrator cleared? If so, this Judge and Saviour of the world must be like the *log*, that Jupiter gave the *frogs* for a king; virtuous and vicious, alike immaterial to him,' &c. Let us examine this. If Christ condemns the crime, and saves the criminal, he *must* be like a *log* of wood. Reverse this—If Christ *approves* the crime, and *destroys* the criminal, he is not like a *log*. Who deals in contradictions now? Is not all sin condemnable? (a synonymous term with damnable.) Can any man be cleared, or saved? If so, is vice and virtue all one with Christ? Now, we ask, if there is nothing condemnable in the sinner, where is his need of a Saviour? And except the perpetrator (sinner) is cleared, (saved,) how can it be said he is saved, if he is to remain endlessly condemned [damned] for his sins? Our correspondent would make the Saviour like the *Serpent* given the *frogs*, in the stead of the log, which devoured them! Our correspondent continues—'And in the next place, as if to contradict yourself for calling him *Judge*, you quote his words, 'If any man hear my words and believe not, I *judge* him not; for I came, *not* to judge the world, but to save the world.' Suppose a physician was to call upon our correspondent, and tell him, 'I am come, not to give you medicine for any disease, but to converse with you,' [or for any other purpose,] would it then follow as an inevitable result, that he was *not* a physician? Our correspondent cannot conceive of the difference between a Judge and an *executioner*; or between condemnation and *endless misery!* Paul declared of the Jews, that 'God hath concluded them all in *unbelief*, that he might have mercy upon all.' We ask our correspondent—If the damnation [condemnation] consequent upon a state of unbelief, means *endless* misery, how can God have *mercy* upon them? We have no hesitation in saying, that no man ever did, or ever will experience the joys of the salvation of God, without repentance; *turning* to the Lord. And if any person will prove that mankind will never repent, *(turn)* we will then acknowledge, that the doctrine of Universal Unconditional salvation, is an idle tale! Our Methodist Friend again confounds the word *defeat*, with *oppose*, and remarks, 'The next thing I observe, is your metamorphose of the meaning of *trusted*, *turning*, and *repented*, to make the import the same.' We believe the reader is by this time satisfied, who it is that would *metamorphose*, or rather confound and pervert! We conclude with the remark, that had our correspondent believed that 'all the ends of the world shall remember and *turn* unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations worship before him,' we think he would have manifested his *faith* by his *works*, and have lifted his voice against that Methodist *heresy*, which would impiously attempt to prove the contrary!

Note. The declaration contained in his P. S. that he 'used the word *grave* in the stead of the word *hell*, as I have heard those of your *creed* say that they are *synonymous*;' however good authority he may consider those of *our* creed, we inform him, that he might in his justification have mentioned the translators of the Bible, who have translated the Greek word *hades*, HELL in Luke xvi. 23. and *grave* in 1 Cor. xv. 55!

We recommend the following extract from Mr. Wesley's notes on the New Testament, and from his sermons, &c., to the attention of all Methodists. And if they will read them with attention, and *believe* the truths declared in them, in *sincerity*, we shall have no objection to consider them as Christians, and believers in the Universal and Unconditional salvation of God!

Extract from Wesley's notes on the New Testament.
1 Cor. xv. 47.

'Christ was not the second man in order of time; but in this respect. That as Adam was a public person, who acted in the stead of all mankind, so was Christ. As Adam was the first general representative of men, Christ was the second and the last. And what they severally did, terminated not in themselves, but affected all whom they represented.'

In his Sermons, vol. i. on the mystery of iniquity, 2 Thes. ii. 7. "And have we not farther ground for thankfulness, yea, and strong consolation, in the blessed hope which God hath given us, that the time is at hand, when righteousness shall be as universal, as unrighteousness is now? Allowing that *the whole creation now groaneth together* under the sin of man, our comfort is, it will not always groan! God will arise and maintain his own cause. And the *whole creation* shall then be *delivered*, both from moral and natural corruption. Sin, and its consequence, pain, shall be no more—holiness and happiness shall cover the earth. Then shall all the ends of the world see the salvation of God. And the *whole race* of mankind shall *know, and love, and serve* God, and reign with him FOR EVER AND EVER!"

In his Sermons vol. ii. the end of Christ's coming is considered. 1 John. v. 8. "But the most glorious of all will be the change which then will take place on the poor, sinful, miserable children of men. These had fallen in many respects as from a great height, so into a lower depth than any other part of the creation. But they shall hear a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them; and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be their God. Rev. xxi. 3, 4. Hence will arise an unmixt state of holiness and happiness, far superior to that which Adam enjoyed in paradise. In how beautiful a manner is this described by the apostle! God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying. Neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are done away. As there will be no more death, and no more pain, or sickness preparatory thereto,—as there will be no more grieving for, or parting with friends, so there will be no more sorrow or crying. Nay, but there will *be no more sin!* And to crown all, there will be a deep, an intimate, an uninterrupted union with God. A constant communion with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, through the Spirit; a continual enjoyment of the three,—One God, *and of all the creatures in him!*"

Communications.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR---I was well aware when I addressed you on the subject of conditional salvation, that it would be entirely out of my power to produce any passages from the word which declared this doctrine, which the Editor would consider as a compliance with his *sine qua non*. I was willing however to give his readers an opportunity to judge, how far the Editor had a reasonable ground for his confident assertions; and, with a view to show that he had no such ground, I quoted from the word, several passages which, in my view, plainly declared salvation to be promised, on the performance of certain conditions on the part of man. I was not then, nor am I now aware, that I was bound, by the terms of the challenge, to show the *same* conditions to be contained in every passage which I quoted. It was enough if I showed *conditions*, and it was perfectly immaterial, whether the condition implied in every passage was the *same* or *different*. I produced or referred to three several passages in the word in which *salvation*, on the performance of a condition was plainly promised, or *damnation* on the non-performance clearly denounced. The first was from Luke [x. 25 to 37] where the condition was *love to God*, and *love towards our neighbour*. The second was from Matthew [xix. 17] where the condition was the *keeping the commandments*. The third was from John (iii. 36) where *faith* on the Son was the condition of salvation, and the *want* of it the cause of condemnation. Now, because in these passages, *the conditions* happen not to be one and the same, I am charged by the Editor, if I understand him, with *incongruity* in my reasoning, and *shuffling* in my dealing. Hear his words. 'We think proper, however, before we dismiss the subject, to notice a *trifling* incongruity in the reasoning of J. C. He in the first place, contends that all those will be endlessly miserable, who do not love the Lord with all their heart, &c.; then, all those will be endlessly miserable, who do not keep all the commandments, (we add here, &c.) and then with unexampled *cruelty*, damns with endless misery all who do not believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; a condition altogether different, and not included in his first, or second set of terms, or conditions! We think a species of dealing like this, in bargains and agreements, and conditions in our world, where the *pocket* is concerned, would subject a man to severe animadversions; but in religion, it seems, you may *shuffle* as much as you please!' (see concluding paragraph but one of his answer.)

These circumstances I deem a sufficient apology, if any be necessary, for receding from my resolution of not replying to the Editor's remarks.

I cannot conceive, for my own part, what incongruity there is in my reasoning, because the condition in my *third* quotation, is altogether *different* from, and *not* included in my *first* or second *set* of terms, or conditions. The Editor might as well have charged me with incongruity, because the condition in my second quotation, was different from that in my first, as because the third is different from that in my first, or because the third is different from both the former. But the question is not as to any *particular* condition; but as to any condition *whatever*. And if I had shown fifty *different* conditions as the prerequisites to salvation, I should have shown salvation to *be* conditional, and that was all that was required. If the Editor can see any *shuffling* in this, he is welcome to the discovery.

Let us see, however, if the Editor himself is *congruous* in all his arguments. The Editor in his fourth paragraph, in the very breath in which he is contending *against* conditions, has himself admitted, that the *law* does require conditions, but that they are performed *for* us, by Christ our head; and therefore that *we* have no conditions to perform. This, according to the Editor's view, is the *Gospel; the good news;* adopting, I suppose, the legal maxim, that what one performs by *proxy*, it is the same thing, as if he had done it *in person*. This may answer in our worldly dealings, but, I fear, will be found to be hardly practicable in religion or morals.

He says, 'Must we be wise? Christ is made unto us *wisdom*. Is holiness or sanctification an indispensable qualification? Christ is made unto us *sanctification*. Do you say we must have something to redeem us from the sins we have committed? We answer, Christ hath done all, and it is ours! He is made unto us *redemption!* Ransack creation and produce one condition which we have not already complied with! The work is done! We have complied with them all!' Now, reader, for I too will appeal to the reader, what does this amount to? Clearly this. 'I admit that there are certain *prerequisites*, conditions, of salvation. But these conditions have been performed by Christ your head. Is it necessary that you should be *wise, holy, pure*, and *good*? Christ, your Head, is *wise, holy, pure*, and *good*. You may be as *ignorant, unholy, impure*, and *wicked* as you please, still your salvation is sure, for Christ your head is all this for you.' This, reader, the Editor will admit; and that too, to avoid *conditions*, (for there is nothing to which he has so great an aversion, as the idea, that man has any thing *to do*, in order to obtain salvation. To give up any of our evils, is far too great a sacrifice, even to purchase salvation itself. I am therefore under the necessity of going a little farther to show the unreasonableness of this.

And *first* I say it is unreasonable to suppose, that *Christ's wisdom* can be *our wisdom*. Christ it is said is the *Head*, we are the members of his body; therefore being the members of his body, we possess in and with the Head the wisdom of the Head. But this is just as unreasonable, as to say, that our *hands*, or our *feet*, possess the *wisdom of the head*. Is it not plain that the members of the body possess *nothing* in common with the head? Suppose he is our head representatively? Does this mend the matter? Is the wisdom of the *representative*, the wisdom of the *represented*? I cannot see that it is.

Secondly, I say it is unreasonable to suppose that *Christ's wisdom is our wisdom*, because *Christ is God, the Supreme God*, (this the Editor has abundantly proved in some of his early numbers) and we are his creatures; and it is certainly unreasonable to suppose, that the wisdom of the *Creator* is, or can be the wisdom of the *creature*. The wisdom of the Creator is wisdom itself, Divine wisdom; the wisdom of the creature is merely human; the wisdom of the Creator, is infinite, the wisdom of the creature is merely finite; to suppose therefore that the wisdom of God is the wisdom of man, is to suppose, that the wisdom of God is *finite*, or that the wisdom of the creature is *infinite*. But perhaps I misapprehend him, he cannot mean that the wisdom of Christ (God,) is ours *actually*, but only *imputatively*, or *virtually*.

Then thirdly, I say, this is more unreasonable still, because to suppose that we can be *wise*, simply by the imputation of another's wisdom, is just about as rational as to suppose, that we can see with the eyes, hear with the ears, or feel by the senses of another, which if any man supposes he can do, I have no objection to his enjoying the illusion.

The same reasoning will show, that it is just as unreasonable to suppose that the *holiness, purity*, or *goodness*, of Christ, can be ours. For they are things not transferable at pleasure.

It is said too, that Christ's *obedience* is *our obedience;* and that he kept the law for us. How such an absurdity could ever have obtained among *rational* creatures, would indeed be wonderful, were it not that our understandings are daily abused with hundreds of others equally gross and ridiculous. To collect from the scriptures the passages in which these doctrines are *said* to be taught, and in every instance to show their true meaning and application, would indeed be treating the subject at length, but I fear would occupy more of my time, and more of the Editor's paper, than we should either of us be willing to devote to the subject. I can therefore, at present, only appeal to the *understanding* of the reader, to say, whether he will believe these absurdities, or whether he will seek some more rational explanation of the subject.

We will now consider how the Editor has replied to the passages I have quoted as containing the terms of conditional salvation. The first passage was from Luke (x. 25.) and was our Lord's reply to the Lawyer, who, *tempting* him, asked him, what he should do to inherit eternal life. To whom our Lord replied, that if he obeyed the *law*, by loving the Lord his God with all his heart, soul and mind, and his neighbour as himself, he should live. Now, the Editor says, this was a question put to *tempt* Jesus, by a cunning lawyer, and not in the way of a humble inquirer after salvation, and therefore our Lord answered in the same cunning manner, and thus by shutting his mouth, referring him to his own law, declined answering his question according to the truth. I answer, in the first place, this is a direct charge upon the character of the blessed Lord, and supposing that he would be guilty of *shuffling* and *evasion* to avoid a direct answer to a question, that was put to him warily, Is it consistent with the Lord's general conduct, thus to evade, on any occasion, the direct avowal of his doctrines, for fear of the Jews? Did he not on the contrary *openly* teach them both in the temple and in their synagogues? and was he not repeatedly charged with being a blasphemer, and branded with every epithet, which the Jews could invent, simply because he did so *openly* and *plainly* inculcate his doctrines? And would he, for the sake of not being caught by the wariness of a subtle Lawyer, have been guilty of the prevarication which the Editor's interpretation of the passage necessarily imputes to him? It is true, we frequently read of the Jews endeavouring to entangle him in his speech; but do we ever read

that he had recourse to prevarication or falsehood, in order to avoid their snares? No, whatever he declared even in answer to their subtle and cunning inquiries, was always the *truth*, and may be implicitly relied on as the truth. The Editor says, it *was* the *truth*, but not a truth inculcated by Jesus, that is, it was a *legal*, not a *Gospel* truth.

I answer, in the second place, that our Lord referred the Jewish lawyer, not *cunningly* to his own law, but *sincerely* and *truly*, and as to a rule which *must* be observed before he could inherit eternal life. In proof of this, I refer to the succeeding verses of the chapter. We are subsequently told, that the lawyer willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, "and who is my neighbour." Jesus, to give him a striking and *practical* reply, one which even the cunningness of the lawyer could not misinterpret, relates to him the parable of the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves. And in conclusion asks him, which he thought was *neighbour* to him that fell among thieves; he who had compassion on, and succoured him in his calamity, or he who passed by on the other side. And the lawyer said, he that showed mercy on him. Our Lord says, "*Go and do thou likewise*" What a beautiful reply to the lawyer's tempting question! Instead of answering him *in kind*, our Lord, ever ready to avail himself of every circumstance to open the minds and understandings of the unbelieving Jews, instructs this learned doctor in the way of salvation, by the most lively and touching story that can well be imagined. Now I will ask, can any one who reads this relation possibly shut his eyes to the truth contained in it? Our Lord had declared before, the way to eternal life; and the Jew understood it too, as is plain from his subsequent inquiry; but like many in our own times, he could not comprehend, how he was to love others as well as himself. And therefore, willing to obtain an answer a little more favourable to his carnal views, and thinking perhaps, like many, that "charity begins at home," asks, and who is my neighbour? The answer has already been given. It speaks to the heart as well as the understanding.

My second reference was to Matt. xix. 17. It was our Lord's reply to the young man who inquired of him, what good thing he should do, that he might have eternal life. To which he replied, if thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments*. The Editor says, this is similar to the passage from Luke. 'The young man asked, what *he* should *do;* and Christ told him.' He did, and he told him the truth, 'if thou wilt enter into life, says he, keep the commandments.' The Editor had not the same advantage here, as on the occasion of our former quotation. Here was no *cunning* lawyer, putting *subtle* questions, (as the Editor conceived him to be) but a humble, modest young man, inquiring what he should do to inherit eternal life. But the Editor says, (for this is the amount of his argument) that our Lord instead of answering him according to the *truth*, answered him according to the *critical* and *technical* (it should seem) manner of asking the question. This modest Jew was not acquainted with the technical language of modern theology, and could not put his question in those precise terms, which it seems our Lord required. In the simplicity of his soul he asks, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life. Reader, can you believe our Lord did not answer this inquiry in the same spirit, in which it was put? Can you believe he would have suffered this sincere inquirer for salvation, to go away sorrowful, merely because the question was put, *what shall I do to inherit*, instead of *how shall I obtain*, eternal life? Do you believe that Christ was such a teacher? If you do, then you must believe he was a deceiver, and not as he himself informs us, 'the way, *the truth* and the life.' But here as before, we have the means of detecting the error. Our Lord's reply to the young man, was in the general terms, 'if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' 'He saith unto him, which? Jesus said, thou shalt do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not bear false witness. Honour thy father and thy mother; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up; what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, if thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions. Now it is *true* that our Lord directed this young man to *keep the commandments*, as a means of his entering into life. It is *true* also, that he had *literally* kept all these commandments from his youth up, and yet that he was *lacking*. In order however that the conclusion at which we shall arrive, may be the more clearly seen, it will be necessary here to show, what our Lord really taught with regard to the commandments.

In his memorable sermon on the mount, which is recorded in the Gospel of Matthew, he has taken great pains to instruct his disciples on the subject, and at the same time all future generations. "Think not, says he, that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." (Matt. v. 17.) "For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever *therefore* shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.' And then he goes on to instruct them from this very law, by opening and enlarging it; informing them that as they had hitherto been accustomed to keep it merely in the *letter*, the time had now come when it must be obeyed in the *spirit* also. This was the great error against which he wished to caution them; that they should not suppose that his doctrines in any way altered or abrogated that rule of life and conversation, which had been prescribed for their observance. The Jews were merely external men, and had no idea of any thing contained in or required by their law but what was *merely external;* they therefore supposed they had fulfilled its precepts, merely by the outward observance of it. This was the lesson which he taught the young man in the answer we have quoted above. He, like the rest of his brethren, had an idea that if he had never imbrued his hands in his brother's blood, he had not been guilty of the crime of murder; that if he had never pilfered his neighbour's goods, he had not been guilty of the crime of stealing; or if he had never actually violated his neighbours bed, he had not been guilty of adultery. But what says our Lord, in this sermon on the mount? "Ye have heard, says he, that it has been said by them of old time, thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; But *I* say unto you, that whosoever shall be *angry* with his brother, without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment,' as if he had said, "ye have heard that it was said of old time thou shalt not kill, whereby ye understand that it is unlawful, actually to take the life of another." But I say unto you, think not that the import of this command extends merely to the *overt act* of killing, but rather understand, that whosoever, *in his heart*, shall bear such anger or hatred against another, as thereby to desire his death, even in thought, or secret purpose, is guilty of a breach of this command and obnoxious to the penalties of it. Again, "ye have heard it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you that whosoever *looketh on* a woman *to lust after her, hath already committed adultery* with her in his heart." Here again so far from there being any thing that can lead us to suppose that our Lord meant to abrogate the command, as a rule of life, he really confirms it, by applying it according to its true and real import; teaching us that *evil designs* in the will, and *evil thoughts* in the understanding, are as much a breach of this commandment as the *act of adultery* itself. Now then we see what this young man lacked, and because he could not receive "this saying" he went away sorrowful. That it was not his *wordly possessions* that our Lord required the young man to give up, is plain, for he says "and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." All the worldly possessions in the earth, would not have purchased him the heavenly treasure. It was his *selfhood, his selfish thoughts and desires* which hindered in his heart the love of God and his neighbour, which he was required to sacrifice, and come and follow Jesus. It is true, the young man's natural state led him to imagine that our Lord had reference to his worldly possessions, because he was rich, and so thought the disciples too, for even they could not always receive his instruction.

The Editor's last argument is soon despatched. If I understand it, it is a mere play on the grammatical construction of the verse. (John iii. 36.) He says Christ is the Saviour of *all* men; but more *especially* of those that believe. This then, is his syllogism; (that is, if I understand it, if not, this must be my apology for misrepresenting him.) to believe that Christ is our Saviour, is to have *everlasting life*. But Christ is the Saviour of *all* men; and to believe that he is the Saviour, of *all* men, is to believe that he is *our* Saviour. When therefore we believe, that Christ is the Saviour of *all* men, then we believe, he is *our* Saviour and then we see everlasting life. Not to believe this, that he is the Saviour of all men, is not to believe that he is *our* Saviour, and while we are in this state, we cannot see life; but the wrath of God abideth on us. The Editor here takes two things for granted, which are the premises of his conclusion; but which, as we do not admit, of course his argument falls to the ground "like the baseless fabric of a vision." First, he supposes it will be admitted, that Christ is *actually* the Saviour of all men, because St. Paul has said "the Saviour of *all* men, especially of those that believe. And secondly, he takes it for granted that *all men* will *believe* this. Now we deny that Christ is the Saviour of all men; and we also deny, that *all* men will believe this. We say more, it cannot be proved. But this is not all; allowing all that the Editor has said, is true. How does this obviate *conditions*. If to *believe*, on the Editor's plan, is necessary to have everlasting life, then he admits a condition in its fullest extent. Faith is as much an act, one way as another; and it is as much an act, in any way, as the deeds of the body. The one is an act of the *understanding*, the other of the *will*, through the instrumentality of the body.

The Editor having interrogated me, in several parts of his reply, asking whether I believe this, or believe that, I will in conclusion give my articles of faith on the subject of salvation. I believe then, that in order to salvation under the Gospel, three things are requisite: *faith*, or a knowledge of and a belief in the truth of God's holy word; *charity*, or love to God and our neighbour, being the foundation of our faith; and *good works*, or a life in conformity thereto. This creed has, I believe, its foundation in the word of God; and can be proved from the letter of the Old and New Testaments; from the law, and from the prophets; from the word of Christ and his apostles.

Should opportunity offer, I may hereafter attempt this proof, and with the Editor's permission, communicate it for the edification of his readers, This communication, however, will close my argument on the present occasion.

Your's, J. C.

ANSWER.

We pass over the first, second, and third paragraphs of J. C.'s communication with the remark, that to suppose conditions, on the performance of which the endless well-being of the souls of millions of the human race depend, and these conditions so *general* (or loose) in their expression, that they cannot be *particularized*, is an absurdity, to say the least of it. And we have no hesitation in declaring, that this hypothesis, which would make salvation conditional, and the conditions *different* in their nature, and requirements, and which denounces damnation (endless misery) in default, and promises endless felicity, on the performance of each, is most emphatically a '*contradiction in terms*.' This will be seen by considering, what *must* be admitted, that a man (were it possible) might keep the *whole law*, and at the same time not *believe* in the *Lord* Jesus Christ:

consequently, if all are damned who do *not* believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, the *keeping the law* would *not* save him, but he would be *damned* likewise. On the other hand;—A man might believe on the Lord Jesus Christ,and *violate the law*, (and 'he that offends in *one* point, is guilty of *all*') consequently,if endless misery is to be the portion of all those who do not keep *all the commandments,he* must be *damned* also! And our Lord declares, 'he that breaketh one of the least of these commandments, &c. shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven;' but according to J. C. he, so far from having any thing to do with the kingdom of heaven, would be consigned to endless misery. Now, we inform J. C. that his remark relative to our discovering incongruity in his reasoning on this head, and our being welcome to it, &c., we think will not satisfy our readers; who we presume will consider the discovery gratuitous, and give the *incongruity* to the original proprietor. We likewise inform J. C. that if he were to produce '*fifty* conditions,' and according to his present *liberality* permit *forty-nine* of them to be *omitted*, and confer endless happiness on those who complied with the *fiftieth*, however strong his arguments might be in favour of *salvation* being *conditional*, he would find it impossible to prove the *damnation* of any in default of complying with them.

J. C. in his fourth paragraph, says, we 'admit that the law requires conditions,' &c. Granted—And we likewise admit, that the law denounced a *punishment* if these conditions were not complied with! But we have *not* admitted that *endless* happiness was the reward, for keeping, nor *endless* misery the penalty, for violating its requirements! And we tell J. C. that he can never prove the salvation, or damnation, of one of the human race, on this ground. We mean by the terms salvation, and damnation, happiness,or misery, in a future state of being. That the law condemns to suffering in *this life*, those who violate it; and rewards with *temporal* blessings in proportion as men conform to it,is a truth which the experience of every man can testify. See Deut. xxviii. We inform J. C. that we do not advocate the doctrine of a man's doing good or evil by *proxy*. His supposition in this case has no foundation, except in his own imagination.

J. C.'s appeal to the reader, in his *fifth* paragraph, may appear very rational to him; but if he had produced any evidence in support of his declaration, that "we admit there are certain *prerequisites*, conditions of salvation," it would have looked a little better. Now we think, that had J. C. said we admitted there *had*, (in the past tense) *been* "prerequisites," he would have come nearer the truth! And the declaration he has *charitably* assigned us,—"you may be as ignorant, unholy, impure, and *wicked as you please*, still your salvation is *sure*," &c. being gratuitous, and unqualified, we shall take the liberty to contrast our doctrine with it, and let the reader dispose of it as he sees proper. Presuming that the reverse of this is the doctrine of J. C., that our salvation is *not* '*sure*,' but depends upon *our* wisdom, holiness, purity, and goodness, independent of any *union* with our Divine Head, his merits, &c. we shall quote a few passages from the Scriptures, and let J. C. apply them. Gal. v. 4. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified *by the law*, ye are *fallen* from grace." iii. 11. "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, *it is* evident; for, the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith; but the man that doeth them shall live *in* them." 2d Cor. v. 18, 19. "And all things *are* of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God *was* in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto *them*." Rom. v. 10. "For if when we were *enemies* we *were* reconciled *to* God by the death of his Son; *much more* being reconciled, we shall be *saved* by his life." (Quere. *When* was Christ crucified? And is this reconciliation *sure*?) viii. 38, 39. "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, &c. nor things *present*, nor things to *come*, &c. shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.' I Epis. John v. 10, 11. "He that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believed not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record,(that the salvation of the soul is not '*sure!*' but depends upon our *good works!* No!) that God hath *given* (not sold) to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son!' Ephes. ii. 8, 9. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that *not* of yourselves; *it is* the *gift* of God. (What are the conditions of a *gift?*) Not of *works*, lest any man should boast!'

We believe with Paul, that "Tribulation and anguish, shall be upon every soul of man that doeth evil." Now if J. C. will prove that men will do evil in a *future* state, we are willing to acknowledge that "tribulation and anguish," shall be *upon* them in a *future* state; but not without. We likewise believe with Paul, that those "who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life." But we do not believe that it is doing *well* to seek for glory, or honour, or immortality, from, or by *our* works, independent of our Divine Head, but in our union with him, and by and from his righteousness, which is ours. Rom. iii. 20 to 25. "Wherefore by the deeds of the *law* there shall no flesh be justified in his sight, for by the law *is* the knowledge of sin. But *now* (now,) the righteousness of God (not ours alone) *without* the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and *upon* all them that believe, for there is no *difference;* for *all* have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified *freely* (not *conditionally*) by *his* grace, (not by *our* works) through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Not in our compliance with conditions! Isaiah xlv. "I HAVE SWORN BY MYSELF, the word is gone out of my mouth —RIGHTEOUSNESS— and shall not return, That unto me *every* knee shall bow, *every* tongue shall swear. Surely shall say, (what? Ans.) In the LORD have I RIGHTEOUSNESS and strength, to him shall come, and all that are incensed against him shall be *ashamed.*" (Not damned with endless misery!) John xvii. I. "These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come. Glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee. (How glorify the Father? Make mankind endlessly miserable! Does the glory of God consist in the misery of his creatures? See what follows.) As thou hast given him power over *all* flesh, (what for?) that he should give eternal *life* to as *many* as thou hast *given* him." And "the Father loveth the Son, and hath given *all* things into his hands!" This is our doctrine. *Confute it who can!* Our faith is founded upon the OATH of JEHOVAH; it is as eternal as the God we worship!

To be concluded next week.

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR,—In lately reading a sermon by the Rev. John Wesley on Free Grace, the following extracts struck me as the most sublime in thought, the most terse in language, and the most tremendously eloquent, of any thing I had ever met with. Should you think them worthy of a place in the Gospel Herald, I have no doubt you will please many of your readers, who may have never perused the sermon. *Gamma.*

After inimitably introducing the subject of the Calvinistic Election, he thus proceeds:—

"Call it by what name you please; Election, Preterition, Predestination, or Reprobation, it comes to the same thing. The sense is plainly this; by virtue of an eternal, unchangeable, irresistible decree of God, one part of mankind are infallibly saved, and the rest infallibly damned, it being impossible that any of the former should be damned, or that any of the latter should be saved."

He proceeded to show that this doctrine is derogatory to God's honour and glory, and that it is full of blasphemy; 'Of such blasphemy,' said he, 'as I should dread to mention, but that the honour of our gracious God, and the cause of truth, will not suffer me to be silent. Such blasphemy this, that it represents the Most Holy God as worse than the devil; as more false, more cruel, and more unjust. More false, because the devil, liar as he is, hath never said he willeth all mankind to be saved; more unjust, because the devil cannot, if he would, be guilty of such injustice as you ascribe to God, when you say, that God condemned millions of souls to everlasting fire for continuing in sin, which, for want of that grace *he will not* give them, they cannot avoid: and more cruel, because that unhappy spirit 'seeketh rest, and findeth none,' so that his own restless misery is a kind of temptation to him to tempt others. But God 'resteth in his high and holy place;' so that to suppose him, out of his mere motion, of his pure will and pleasure, happy as he is, to doom his creatures, whether they will or not, to endless misery, is to impute such cruelty to him, as we cannot impute even to the great enemy of God and man. It is to represent the Most High God as more cruel, false, and unjust than the devil!

"This is the blasphemy clearly contained in the *horrible decree* of Predestination. And here I fix my foot. On this I join issue with every asserter of it. You represent God as worse than the devil. But you say, you will prove it by scripture. Hold! What will you prove by scripture? That God is worse than Satan? It cannot be. Let the Scripture mean what it will, it cannot mean that the Judge of all the world is unjust. No scripture can mean that God is not love, or that his mercy is not over all his works: that is, whatever it prove beside, no scripture can prove predestination.'

'This is the blasphemy for which I abhor the doctrine of Predestination; a doctrine, upon the supposition of which, if one could possibly suppose it for a moment, call it election, reprobation, or what you please, (for all comes to the same thing) one might say to our adversary the devil, 'Thou fool, why dost thou roar about any longer? Hearest thou not, that God hath taken thy work out of thine hands, and that he doth it more effectually? Thou, with all thy principalities and powers, canst only so assault that we may resist thee; but he can irresistibly destroy both body and soul in hell! Thou canst only entice; but his unchangeable decree to leave thousands of souls in death, compels them to continue in sin until they drop into everlasting burnings. Thou temptest; he forceth us to be damned, for we cannot resist his will. Thou fool! Why goest thou about any longer, seeking whom thou mayest devour? Hearest thou not that God is the devouring lion, the destroyer of souls, and the murderer of men? Moloch caused only children to pass through the fire, and the fire was soon quenched; for that corruptible body being consumed, its torments were at an end; but God, thou art told, by his eternal decree, fixed before they had done good or evil, causes not only children of a span long, but the parents also, to pass through the fire of hell; that fire which never shall be quenched: and the body which is cast thereinto, being now incorruptible and immortal, will be ever consuming and never consumed; but the smoke of their torment, because it is God's *good* pleasure, ascendeth up for ever and ever.

'O, how would the enemy of God and man rejoice to hear these things were so! How would he cry aloud, and spare not! How would he lift up his voice, and say, To your tents, O Israel! flee from the face of this God, or ye shall utterly perish! But whither will ye flee? Into heaven? He is there. Down to hell? He is there also. Ye cannot flee from an omnipresent, almighty tyrant. And whether ye flee, or stay, I call heaven, his throne, and earth, his footstool, to witness against you: ye shall perish, ye shall die eternally! Sing, O hell! and rejoice, ye that are under the earth! for God, even the Mighty God, hath spoken, and devoted to death thousands of souls, from the rising of the sun, unto the going down thereof. Here, O death,is thy sting! They shall not, cannot escape, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. Here, O Grave, is thy victory! Nations yet unborn, or ere they have done good or evil, are doomed, never to see the light of life, but thou shalt gnaw upon them for ever. Let all those morning stars sing together who fell with Lucifer, son of the morning! Let all the sons of hell shout for joy; for the decree is past, and who shall annul it?'

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1821. NO. 43.

Controversial.

ANSWER TO J. C.

[*Concluded.*]

J.C. commences his *sixth* paragraph thus—"And, *first* I say, it is unreasonable to suppose, that *Christ's* wisdom can be *our* wisdom. Christ, it is said, is the *Head*, we are the members of his body; therefore, being the members of his body, we possess *in* and with the Head, the wisdom of the Head. But this is just as unreasonable as to say, that our *hands*, or our *feet*, *possess* the wisdom of the *head*. Is it not plain, that the *members* of the body possess *nothing* in *common* with the *Head*?" To this we answer—we think J. C. from a consciousness of the indefensibility of his cause, by any attempt at producing testimony from the Scriptures to support him, has, as a last resort, introduced what we presume he intended for *reason*. Now the Scriptures are consistent with *reason* and truth; and we shall first, examine J C.'s *reasoning*, and then, appeal to the Scriptures for evidence to support us. His argument is predicated upon an assumed position—'that the *members* of the body possess nothing in common with the *Head*.' Now, if this declaration is strictly true, it would do no injury to J. C. to *cut his head off!* Surely, if the 'head and the members possess nothing in *common*,' in unity, but each have a *separate* source from which they derive their nourishment and being, they can exist, and do as well *separate*, as together, and united! When J. C. is *hungry*, and his head performs the part of *masticating* his food, we think, that if his *stomach* did not receive, and *digest* it, his *head* would *lose* its labour. And if the *lacteals* and *lymphatic* vessels did not receive and convey the *chyle*, and *lymph*, and the several members assist in the circulation of the blood to the *head*, that the head would be able to boast of its wisdom but a short time! Cut off a man's *foot*, the meanest member of his body, and the *head* would in vain try to conceal its *pain*, the sympathy it felt for the *foot;* and if it did, we think the *pale* and distorted countenance would betray it. How beautifully appropriate are the words of the apostle? 'And whether *one* member *suffer*, all the members *suffer* with *it;* or *one* member be *honoured*, *all* the members *rejoice* with it.' 1 Cor. xii. 12 to 27 'For as the body is *one*, and hath *many* members, and *all* the members of that *one* body, being *many*, are *one* body; so also is *Christ*. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body *were* an eye, where *were* the hearing? If the whole *were* hearing, where *were* the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where *were* the body? But now *are they* many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary: And those *members* of the body, which we think to be less honourable, upon these we bestow more abundant honour, and our uncomely *parts* have more abundant comeliness. For our comely *parts* have no need; but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that *part* which lacked; that there should be no schism in the body; but *that* the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." Now we ask, in the words of Paul—'If they were all *one* member, where *were* the *body*, &c. But now *are they* many members, yet but *one* body.' Now, we ask, Does not the *feet possess* the *benefit* which the *head* possesses, from the exercise of the *wisdom* of the *head*? Does not the *head* help the *feet*, and by its wisdom *direct* them? Therefore, the head is 'made unto them *wisdom!*' Does not the head and feet enjoy the wisdom in *common*? 'Can the *head* say to the *feet*, I have *no need of you*?' Surely not!

J. C continues—'Suppose he is our head *representatively*? Does this mend the matter? Is the wisdom of the *representative* the wisdom of the *represented*? I cannot see that it is.' Now we like to be consistent. We have a reason for this. For we believe, in proportion as any person is *inconsistent*, and contradictory, in that proportion he is in *error!* Has not the inspired apostles introduced the anatomical figure of the human body to describe the *union* of Christ with *all* men, his church? Is the *head* the *representative* of the *hands*, or the *feet*, according to the proper understanding of the declaration, that the *many* members are *one* body, and according to the proper acceptation of the word *representative*. We say, No! Although it may be argued that any insult offered to the *representative* of the United States in the court of an European monarch, would be offering an insult to the nation whom he *represented*, and this in a qualified sense be admitted, still, we ask, Would the people of the United States *die*, if he died? Could it be said they were *buried* with him, if he was *buried*? We think not! A representative, therefore, might *suffer*, and those whom he represented *not* suffer *with* him.

J. C. in his *seventh* paragraph, says, 'It is unreasonable to suppose, that *Christ's* wisdom is *our* wisdom, because Christ is God,' &c. Now, we consider this a mere subterfuge. In the language of inspiration itself, we declared, that 'Christ of God is made unto us *wisdom, righteousness*,' &c. Does J. C wish to evade this, by accommodating us with a phraseology to suit *his* purposes? Is not the wisdom and righteousness of Christ sufficient? Where will you get a *better*? Do not the Scriptures declare, that we shall be 'heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ?' Are we to be *heirs* of God, and at the same time *inherit nothing* from him? Cannot God give us of his wisdom, without giving *all* his wisdom? Every *good* we possess, is given by God; and J. C,'s argument, if it prove any thing, proves *too much* for him!

J. C. taking it for granted he *had* carried all before him, commences his *eighth* paragraph, by again accommodating us with a position, and then commences his attack with renewed vigour, and double resolution. 'This [says he] is *more* unreasonable still, because to suppose that we can be wise simply by *imputation* of another's wisdom,' &c.,—Stop a moment. First, convict us of the *premises*, and then you may charge the *conclusions!* If any thing is given to a man, it is *his;* there is no *imputation* in the case. If *imputing* any thing to a man, made it his, we think property of every kind would be held by a very slender tenure.

J. C.'s *ninth* paragraph, of consequence, being *an abortion*, we proceed to the—

Tenth, in which J. C. *wonders*, with great *wonder*, that any person should believe that we had any concern in the *obedience* of Christ, &c., because certain passages of Scripture are *said* to teach this. We presume he alluded to the following—'We being *many* are *one* body *in* Christ, and members one of another. Ephes. ii. 16. For both *he* that sanctifieth, and *they* who are sanctified, are *all* of *one*. Heb. ii. 11. Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened *us together with* Christ. Ephes. ii. 5. According to his mercy he saved us (in the past tense) by the washing of *regeneration* (not the new birth) and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly (not sparingly) through Jesus Christ our Saviour.' Titus iii. 5, 6. Now, J. C. not being at leisure to expound these, and many other passages of similar import, appeals to the understanding of the reader, to say, 'whether he will believe these *absurdities*, (that these passages *mean* what they *say*) or seek some *more rational* explanation of the subject.' As if J. C. had said, Gentle reader, I have no arguments at present to spare;—Take *my* word for it—if I had opportunity, I could prove any thing. At least, I could prove that these passages are great absurdities, and not one of them means what it says. We hope our readers will give the apostles of Christ as much credit as they deserve, and no more. And attach as much credit to J. C.'s negative, as *it* deserves, and no more. And we think J. C. is entitled to reproof, for his presumption, in arrogating the prerogative of judging without *authority*, and condemning without *evidence!*

J. C. in his *eleventh* paragraph, replies to our remarks on the passage quoted from Luke x. 25, &c. We think a candid appeal to *facts* will do much better than many words to little purpose. J. C. acknowledges that the Jews frequently endeavoured to *entangle* Christ in his speech, and asks—'Do we ever read that he had recourse to *prevarication* or *falsehood* in order to evade their snares?' Now we tell J. C. plainly, that he has recourse to *prevarication*, in order to evade our interrogatories! Why does J. C. *distort* the subject in this manner? Is answering a question *directly*, and truly, prevarication and falsehood? Does not the Evangelist declare that the lawyer 'tempted Christ?' Will J. C. presume to say, that Christ never evaded, or refused to give a *direct* answer to any question put him by the Jews? If so, read the following—Matt. xxi. 23. to 27. 'The chief priests said, By what authority doest thou these things? &c And Jesus answered, and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I, in likewise, will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, Whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven, he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe in him? But if we shall say, Of men, we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet. And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, *Neither tell I you* by what authority I do these things.' Christ answered the lawyer *directly* to his question. But here is an instance, where he even *refused* to answer. The reader will judge, whether J. C. or the Editor, accuses Christ of prevarication, or falsehood! The term *cunningly*, introduced by J. C. and palmed upon us, we confidently trust the reader will put to the account of its promulgator. It is a little remarkable, that J. C. should manufacture premises, and then blame *us* for their conclusions!

J. C. in his *twelfth* paragraph, again insists upon that, which we have never denied, and says, Christ answered the lawyer *sincerely*, &c. J. C. contending that none can inherit eternal life, but those who keep the whole law, &c., defines the duties which are necessary, and *indispensable*, by introducing the 'poor Samaritan.' Now we are willing to try J. C. on his own ground. We ask him—Did you ever see a person poor and miserable, and pass by on the other side? If so, you have judged *yourself* to eternal damnation! We submit this to the conscience of J. C. 'Go thou, and do likewise,' is the command—Did you ever in *one* instance consult your *carnal* views? If so, the sentence has passed from your *own* mouth!

In his *thirteenth* paragraph, he replies to our remarks on his quotation from Matt. xix. 17. and it is his opinion, that we have not the same advantage here, that we had in the former case. There is no cunning lawyer in the case—a modest young man is the actor in this business, &c. We shall see presently, who has the advantage! This young man, it appears, asked Christ, 'What good thing shall I do, (I, I will do it. only tell me what is to be done! What shall *I* do?) that I may have eternal life.' J. C. says, "But the Editor says, for this is the amount of his argument, that our Lord, instead of answering him *according* to the *truth*, answered him according to the *critical* and *technical*, it should seem, manner of *asking* the question!" This is the first time we ever heard that a '*critical*' or '*technical*' answer is *false*. Reader, How does J. C. answer us? Who is it that manufactures these phrases, or introduces them on this occasion? Have we ever said, either directly or by inference, that Christ in any instance, whatever, answered any person falsely? If so, the person who will produce such declaration shall receive the most grateful thanks and acknowledgments! J. C. continues—'Reader, can you believe our Lord did not answer this inquiry in the *same* spirit in which it was put? Can you believe he would have suffered this sincere inquirer for salvation, to go away sorrowful, merely because the question was put, *What shall I do* to inherit, instead of *How shall I obtain* eternal life? Do you believe that Christ was such a teacher? If you do, then you must believe he was a deceiver, and not, as he himself informs us, 'The way, the truth, and the life.' To this, we answer—We shall take the liberty to judge of the *spirit* in which the young man came, from the *spirit* in which he went *away!* And we believe Christ answered the young man in a *better* spirit than *he* asked. And farther—If *Christ* is the *way*, the truth, and the life! the law is not the *way*, the truth, nor the life. There is only *one* right way! 'There is no other name given under heaven, among men, whereby we *must* be saved, but the name of Jesus!' And Christ answered the young man directly, and sincerely, 'I am God, and beside me there is no *Saviour*.' The young man asked Christ, in effect, what *he* should *do* to save *himself!* And the young man went away *dissatisfied*. Why? Ans. Because he had undertaken more than he could accomplish!

J. C. In his *fourteenth* paragraph, quotes from Christ's sermon on the mount, to illustrate the case in question; and we, not wishing a better explanation than that given by Christ, shall likewise apply it. Christ says, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to *fulfil*.' Will the object for which Christ came be *accomplished*? What says the law? 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, mind, soul, and strength; and thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commands hang all the law and the prophets.' The law and the prophets will *never* be *fulfilled*, until *all* the human race love the Lord their God with all their heart, mind, soul, and strength; and their neighbour as themselves! Will this ever be done? Is the time coming when all men will thus *love*, and *obey*? Yes! For Christ declares—'Verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till *all be fulfilled*.' This is glorious testimony! And, with the greatest satisfaction we add, 'Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of the *least* of these commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever shall do and teach them, shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall *exceed* the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case *enter* into the kingdom of heaven.' We ask, What is the kingdom of heaven? Ans. 'Not meats, nor drinks, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.' Now, the first and great commandment is, to love the Lord our God, &c.; and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt *love thy neighbour as thyself!* Who is our neighbour? J. C. has answered—The *miserable!* All men are, and ought to be neighbours. Can that man love his neighbour as *himself*, who considers his neighbour not to be one half so *good* as himself? What constitutes a man a Pharisee? Ans. To justify *himself*, and condemn *others!* The Pharisee, therefore, breaks a *great* commandment, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as *thyself!*' He cannot 'enter into the kingdom of heaven, or enjoy '*righteousness*, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;'—Why? Because he is trusting to his *own* righteousness, like the 'young man,' and with all his professions, he is sorrowful!' Not so they, who believe 'Christ has made peace through the blood of *his* cross, by *him* (not our own individual goodness) to reconcile *all* things unto himself.' This is the *fulfilment* of the law and prophets. 'But now we see not *yet* all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he by the grace of God should taste death *for every man*. (And) When he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.' Heb. i. ii. Therefore, Christ being the *only* '*way*, truth, and life,' it is impossible for any man to enter through any *other* door; call it by what name you please. Did the young man want to enter through *this* door? If so, what prevented him? Why was he *sorrowful*? Or, why was he *dissatisfied*? Ans. From the same reason that mankind are dissatisfied now. In the words of J. C. 'All the worldly possessions on the earth, would not have purchased him the heavenly treasure. It was his *selfish thoughts* and desires, which hindered in his heart the love of God and his neighbour, which he was required to sacrifice, and come and follow him.' We acknowledge this to be the pith and marrow of the matter! The 'young man had great possessions'—What were they? Ans. Conceptions of his *own* righteousness! 'Sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven!' Here is *cause* and *consequence*. Why *sell* all thou hast? Ans. The figure is correct. If he exchanged his *own* righteousness for the righteousness of *Christ*, he would be a great *gainer!* Who were the *poor* alluded to? Ans. Those whom the young man thought were, in comparison with *himself*, very wicked, and destitute of righteousnes. How *give* to them to the *poor*? Ans. *Give*, or allow them that heaven which you claim an *exclusive* right to! And then *you* shall have treasure in heaven. Why? How is this? Ans. If you consent that sinners, *poor*, miserable sinners, will be *saved*, and believe that God will be merciful to *them*, you will likewise, as a consequence, believe that God will have mercy upon you, who are (with all your conceptions of your *own* righteousness) a *poor* miserable sinner *likewise!* Then you shall have peace with God, and joy in the Holy Ghost. 'For except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven!' Here is the grand secret. Sell all that thou hast! Away with *thy* righteousness---thy conceited notions, and admit all men to be beloved of God! Consider every man as your neighbour—remember, it is your duty to love every man as yourself; and to consider their salvation of as much consequence in your heavenly Father's mind, as yours, and that it ought to be so in your own mind. Man looketh at the outward appearance, but God searcheth the heart. 'Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?' He has declared that 'all are gone out of the way, that there is none good, *no, not one!*' No longer come with the tale of your own goodness. Nor 'thank God, that you are not as other men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, nor even as this poor publican;' who, while your vanity is busy in arrogating virtues to which you have no claim, is in secret smiting his hand upon his heart, and crying, 'God be merciful to me a sinner!'. Remember, that 'by grace ye are saved, through faith, and that *not* of yourselves, it is the gift of God. *Not* of works, lest any man should boast.' And where is the man of all Adam's sinful race, who can lay his hand upon his heart, and say, I never *coveted* in thought. I was never angry with my brother (any man) without a *cause*. I never had '*evil* desires in *my* will, nor *evil* thoughts in my understanding, which are as much a breach of the commandments, as 'overt acts themselves.' We ask J. C. Can you receive these sayings? Dare you presume to arrogate to yourself *purity in thought, word, and deed*? You dare not do it. Out of your own mouth shall you be judged. 'He that offends in *one* point, is guilty of *all!*' And you having named your conditions, *perfect holiness*, must fall in consequence. Hear the declaration of an inspired apostle. 'If we say we have no sin, we *deceive* ourselves, and the truth is *not* in *us*.' And you, if you acknowledge you *have* sin, adjudge yourself to hell! Therefore, 'Sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou *shalt* have treasure in heaven. For except *your* righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.' We entreat thee, therefore, not to 'go away *sorrowful*,' but sell thy great possessions, and give to the poor, and *thou* shalt have treasure in heaven!' For 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.'

J. C. in his *fifteenth* paragraph, declares, 'The Editor's last argument is *soon* despatched.' The reader is the best judge of this matter. He continues---'If I understand it, it is a mere play on the grammatical construction of the verse. *He* says, Christ is the Saviour of *all* men; especially those that believe. This, then, is his *syllogism*,' &c. Now we inform J. C. that our syllogism is an affirmative one; and that our premisses will never be disproved, nor their conclusions avoided, by the following---'the Editor here takes two things for granted, which are the *premisses* of his conclusion; *but* which, as WE do not *admit* (them,) of *course* his *argument falls* to the ground, like the baseless fabric of a vision. Reader, what do you call this? It seems if '*we* admitted' them, the *fabric* would have a *basis!* We inform J. C. seriously, that if our *premisses* had no better foundation than *his* admission of their truth, they would indeed *fall* to the ground. And on the other hand, they having the Scriptures for their foundation, can stand as well without, as with his admission! J. C. continues---'First, he *supposes* it will be admitted, that Christ is *actually* the Saviour of *all* men, because St. *Paul* has *said*, 'The Saviour of *all* men, especially of those that believe.' Reader, recollect the reason assigned above, why our premisses *fell* to the ground, was, because '*we* do not *admit*' them! What a pity it is that *St Paul*, who *admits* them, is not as good authority as '*we!*' J. C. continues---'And secondly, he takes it for *granted* that all men will believe this.' We presume J. C. considers every thing *taken* for granted, that '*we* do not admit;' and which, '*of course*, falls to the ground,' as an inevitable consequence. J. C. having a poor memory, we again quote the following, and when he can produce the same OATH of JEHOVAH, that some, or any, or all shall *not believe*, he shall be heard! Isaiah xlv. 23, 24. 'I have sworn by Myself, the word is gone out of my mouth, righteousness---and shall not return, That unto me *every* knee shall bow, *every* tongue shall swear—Surely, shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength; to him *shall come*, and *all* that are incensed against him shall be ashamed.' J. C. continues---'Now *we* deny that Christ *is* the Saviour of *all* men; and *we* also deny that *all* mankind will *believe* this. We say more, it *cannot* be proved.' And we say it *can!* Proof. 'All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O LORD; and shall glorify thy name. All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. Wherefore, God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *every tongue* should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' Psalm xxii lxxxvi. Phil. 2. J. C. continues---'But this is not all. Allowing all that the Editor has said, is true, How does this obviate conditions? If to *believe*, on the Editor's plan, is *necessary* to have everlasting life, then he admits a condition in its fullest extent. *Faith* is as much an act, one way as another,' &c. Stop---Your *lungs* and *heart*, are *necessary* to the life of your body, and if you admit they are *necessary*, you admit a *condition* as regards your natural *life*. Pray what did J C. *do*, to procure him self his *heart* and *lungs*? We answer---Just as

much as he can do to procure *faith!* For *faith* is the *gift* of *God.* When a proper distinction is made between the words *cause* and *condition*, the difficulty will vanish.

J. C. concludes, with giving his 'articles of faith, on the subject of salvation.' First. 'Faith, or a knowledge of, and belief in the *truths* of God's holy word.' J. C. has not informed us particularly, whether this faith is a *sine qua non* in this life; although we presume this to be the case, as he mentions those who die in their sins. J. C. has not said we must believe *all* the truths of God's holy word. And from the circumstance of his *denying* a *part*, we presume a part *only* is necessary. Second. '*Charity*, or love to God and our neighbour, being the *foundation* of our *faith*.' Let us examine this. His faith is *founded* on his *charity*, or love to God and his neighbour. And he has that *charity* for his *neighbours*, (mankind) to believe a considerable part of them are not so good as *himself*, and God will *pass* them by and leave them in sin and misery, and out of regard to *his* goodness, reward *him* with endless felicity. Third. '*Good works*, or a life in conformity thereto.' Now we very much question, whether those works are very *good*, which exalt ourselves---limit the mercy of God to a part---and consign our neighbour, whom we despise as our inferior, to interminable wretchedness!

Communications.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

In a late Number of the paper that passes under the above sacred title, I noticed some sentiments ascribed to Isaac Watts, concerning infants, and notwithstanding the promptness with which they were stigmatized with the epithet of *error*, yet if mankind is possessed of two distinct natures, the one earthly and creaturely, the other spiritual, and if it is true, as Christ says, that 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and if also it is true, that 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven,' then, it may be possible that there is more of truth than error in the above-mentioned sentiments, or conclusion of Watts. To consider any thing relative to their going to hell, is unnecessary. The idea of such a dreadful consequence, is so derogatory to every attribute of the Almighty, as to be disgusting to all, but the few, who yet remain stupified with the selfish nostrums of Calvinism. But although it is thus certain, they are not subjects of endless misery, yet it does not follow with equal clearness, that they must enter into the enjoyments of those, who have 'come through great tribulation.' To come at this with a degree of certainty that will be satisfactory, it is necessary to consider, first, what heaven is—second, the capacity of an infant for its enjoyment---and third, whether there is any thing in the child necessarily existing, or immortal. Heaven consists in *righteousness*, *peace*, and *joy* in the *Holy Ghost*. First, in righteousness---where every thing is right, and nothing wrong; and it consists or exists in the same proportion as righteouspess exists, or where the will or order of God is done and complied with---it is nigh at hand, not far off above the clouds---it is where Christ is, and where God is---'it is within.' Where God is, heaven is. But God is every where; and heaven is every where to those, who are brought into *peace* with him through Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit. The enjoyments of heaven are spiritual, and nothing but spiritual life and sensibility can enjoy them. But the infant is *flesh;* that which is born of flesh is flesh, and all flesh is as grass, fading, withering, perishing. There is a natural body, and a spiritual body; but that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is earthly, and afterwards that which is spiritual. The infant has only the first of these bodies---this constitutes the necessity, (and there is no other) of regeneration. 'Marvel not, said Christ, that I say ye must be born again,' *for* 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' The first birth is only into this world, or into the creaturely nature---the second birth, or regeneration, is into the spiritual life, or world; and this is salvation---life eternal---being saved, or changed from and out of a perishing nature, into an immortal everlasting nature. The first of these is that *curious* state of goodness, wherein both you and Dean agreed that a man could be neither saved nor damned. The second is a state far more glorious, for the glory of the latter shall exceed the glory of the former house. The first state, is that of Adam, or earthy, wherein all die. The second, is Christ, wherein all are made alive. Now over all from Adam to Moses, that is, from the time of their carnal creation to the time of their receiving a law, death reigns even over those who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, disobedience.

DODDRIDGE.

REMARKS.

We inform our correspondent that an *infant* is no *more*, nor no less *flesh*, than the *adult* of threescore years and ten! We likewise inform him, that he has confounded *regeneration* and the being *born again*, or new birth as it is called. See Number 32, page 130, 1st col. Number 35, page 144, 3d col. where regeneration and the new birth are distinctly considered, &c. The prophet declared, 'Lo, children are the heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is his reward.' And Christ declared, 'Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.' And an apostle declared, 'As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.' Again, 'As in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive.' Our correspondent's remark, 'The *first* of these, (the *earthly*,) is that *curious* state of goodness, wherein both you and Dean agreed, that a man could be neither saved nor damned,' without some qualification, may lead to a misunderstanding. The state, (if it can be called a state,) mentioned by Dean, was, indeed, a very *curious* state. It amounted to nonentity, in fact, or annihilation. Therefore, we considered, in this view of the subject, salvation, and condemnation, out of the question. Now our opinion is, that *infants*, as well as adults, are in the hand of their heavenly Father; that they are *his* heritage, and will be blessed by him, and received into his presence, and at his right hand, where are fulness of joys, and pleasures for evermore!

For the Gospel Herald.

Mr Editor,—Permit me to submit for your consideration, the following passages of Scripture. Psalm xi 6. 'Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest: this shall be the portion of their cup.' Rev. xiv. 11. 'And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever,' &c., together with its connexion. These passages are generally brought forward by our opponents, to disprove the doctrine of an Unconditional and Universal salvation. The former is considered as descriptive of the misery of the wicked, and its certainty; and the latter, of its interminable duration. An exposition of the above texts, through the medium of the 'Gospel Herald,' will be gratefully acknowledged by a subscriber.

A YOUTH.

Psalm xi. 6.

"*Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest; the portion of their cup.*"

This passage must be understood, either *literally*, or *figuratively*; there is no middle way of accommodation which can be authorized by any principle, save the dogmas of sectarians; which, however they may have their influence on the minds of some men, must retire into the back ground at the appearance of reason, candour, and common sense. Wishing to elucidate this subject in a fair, open, and unprejudiced manner, and to admit all that can justly be deduced from it in proof of endless misery, in a future state; and at the same time, to arrive at the proper and exclusive meaning of the passage, we shall, first, admit the commonly received opinion, that it is to be considered according to its *literal* import, and reason accordingly. And first, It is declared, 'upon the *wicked* he shall rain snares,' &c Not on *some* wicked men; a *part*—those who do not repent in *this* life—but 'upon the wicked;' (definitively) and as there is no distinction or exception made, we shall not presume to make any! We believe the threatenings and punishments denounced in the Scriptures against sin, as firmly as we believe the promises of God.

Who are the wicked? The Scriptures shall decide. Rom. iii. 9 to 12. 'What then? are we better *than they?* No, in nowise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; As it is written, There is none righteous, *no*, not *one!* There is *none* that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are *all* gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is *none* that doeth good, *no*, not *one!*' All men, therefore, without exception, are *wicked*. And if endless misery is to be the portion of the wicked, Universal damnation must result from these premises. Now, we contend, that we have no rule, whether this passage is considered according to its literal or figurative import, but the Scriptures. They must, and shall decide. And it is an inevitable conclusion, that if the punishment denounced is construed to mean endless misery, and the wicked to be the subjects of it, that not one of the human race can be saved! The reader, however, will notice, that the making this punishment take place in a *future* state, is altogether gratuitous. This is a mere compliment, paid to the orthodoxy of the day; and may be considered as a member of the beast which has been gendered in the imaginations of men, and fed and nourished with religious pride and prejudice, until it has assumed a shape and size, truly appalling and dreadful. Let it be remembered, that it is not a matter of courtesy with mankind, to accept or reject conclusions at pleasure. After having established premisses, they *must* father their conclusions. 'This is a war in which there is no discharge.'

That this punishment is not in a *future* state, and of endless duration, we have abundant testimony to prove. In the 7th Psalm, 8th and 9th verses, the prophet prays, (we believe in faith) as follows—'The Lord shall judge the people; judge me, O Lord, according to my righteousness, and according to mine integrity in me. O let the wickedness of the wicked *come to an end;* but establish the just. cxlv. 20, 21. The Lord preserveth all them that love him; but all the wicked will he destroy. My mouth shall speak the praise of the Lord; and let *all flesh* bless his holy name.' When, therefore, the *wickedness* of the wicked shall come to an *end*, the wicked will be destroyed; and *all flesh* will speak the praise of the Lord. The same prophet prays, 'Bring my soul out of prison, that *I* may praise thy name.' What prison did he allude to? Ans. He said, 'The pains of hell gat hold upon me, I found trouble and sorrow,' therefore, it was the prison of *sin*. And Christ was manifested, 'that he might destroy death, and him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.' Again, 'Tribulation and anguish shall be upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile.' It is in the body, in this life, that men do evil; and when the wicked are destroyed, evil will cease. It is the design of God to do this. Shall not his design be accomplished? Will not the devil and his works be destroyed? Yes! As certain as Omnipotence can, and will do all his pleasure. The passage, therefore, is to be taken figuratively; as describing the 'wrath of God revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness.' And not, as the Poet describes, to *beat upon the* sinner's *naked soul, in one eternal storm.*

(*Rev.* xiv. 11. *will be considered in our next.*)

Specimen of Modern Theology.

In the National Advocate, of the 3d inst. is the following, which is extracted from under the head of 'Another appeal,' &c and signed by Philip Milledoler, Alex. Proudfit, and Gardiner Spring.

'That Saviour who spared not himself in *our* cause; who redeemed *us* to God by his *own* blood,

is now looking down from his throne in the expectation that each professed disciple will be cheerful in the performance of his duty. Come forward with *us*, then, and let us make another effort to *obtain for him* a *greater* portion of the Heathen *as* his inheritance, and *another* region of the earth *for* his possession.'

Reader, whatever may be your religious opinions, to whatever sect, or profession, you may belong, we earnestly entreat you to take your Bible, and with us examine the above 'Appeal.' Remember, that your faith or opinions, however tenaciously adhered to, or zealously advocated, can never alter the truth, or make one hair *white*, or black. And that the declarations of men, high or low, rich or poor, dignified or debased, in the estimation of their fellows, can never borrow from adventitious circumstances, and misguided opinions, any thing better than an ascendency, as ephemeral in duration, as it is corrupt in principle. This Appeal is a striking illustration of the inconsistency, and peccability of man. We here see men, whose religious sentiments, and doctrines, are as opposite as the poles, and who on other occasions have manifested a disposition to maintain their particular doctrines, and each denounce as *error* the doctrines of the other, associating, and with their names giving currency to opinions, and sentiments, which, in their individual capacity, they have *denied* and *condemned!*

This *trio* consists of the professed disciples of Calvin and Hopkins.

In the 'Evangelical Guardian and Review,' to which is annexed the name of Philip Milledoler, Vol. 1. Number 10, p. 442, we read as follows—'It appears, then, whether the '*appeal*' be made to the standards of our church, or to the testimony of Christian experience, or to the oracles of the living God, that sinful man is *unable* to repent, to believe, or to do his will.'* Number 12, page 537, speaking of the *atonement* by Christ. 'This he did for all for whom his sacrifice was offered; and, *if* he made atonement for *all* mankind, then, assuredly, *must all be saved, if the Judge of all the earth does right.* But this *we* know is *not* the case. The Judge of all the earth will do right; but the day is coming when his righteousness shall be revealed before an assembled universe; *not* in the salvation of *all* mankind, but in that of his chosen, for whom Christ offered his perfect sacrifice; and in the condemnation of *all* the workers of iniquity.'

Reader, this is the Calvinists' creed. Christ died for only a *part*, a *definite* number, and all for whom Christ died, *will* be saved, and no others. Now hear the Hopkinsian. Gardiner Spring declares, (see his sermon on the doctrine of Election,) 'It has never yet been proved that Christ died exclusively for the *elect*. If language has any meaning, we are *bound* to believe that he tasted death for *every man*. God has provided a full and complete atonement for all their sins.' This book, published under the auspices of Philip Milledoler, &c. declares, (remarking upon this very sermon,) of *this doctrine*, that it 'appears to us as calculated to lead most directly to the *bold infidelity* that entirely *denies* all atonement.'

In this Appeal, the Calvinist, who declares the *elect* shall be saved, and no others—for Christ died alone for them—and the Hopkinsian, whose doctrine 'leads most directly to *bold infidelity*,' are united, and say, 'Come forward, then, with *us!*' With us! Who are *we*? And what is your object? Hear—Hear—'Let *us* make another effort to obtain *for* him (Christ) a *greater* portion of the heathen as his inheritance!' Who, we ask, obtained for Christ the *little* portion of the heathen, which he already has? Was it *us*? Where now, Philip Milledoler, is the '*bold infidelity*,' which would extend, or make the atonement of Christ '*indefinite*' in its extension? And where now, Gardiner Spring, is the truth of your declaration, in your sermon, when speaking of the *non-elect*, you say, 'If they are not elected, they will indeed perish?'

What is your 'appeal to the public? It is a repetition of the continued cry *give—give*—like the daughters of the horse-leach, mentioned by Solomon! What is the *token* you hold out? Ans. Salvation; when you have declared, on the one part, that 'If they are not elected, they will indeed perish.' And on the other—that 'Sinful man is *unable* to repent or believe;' and that God will be revealed, 'not in the salvation of *all* mankind, but in that of his *chosen*,' &c. If these declarations are true, where is the sincerity of your appeal? Of Christ, you say, 'who redeemed *us!*' Produce your evidence that he redeemed *you*, and left one of the race of Adam! Will you, poor impotent sinners, obtain *for* Christ a *greater* portion of the Heathen,' than *is* his without you? The *Heathen* are *his* inheritance; they are not *yours* to give! Will you '*obtain for him another* region of the *earth* for his possession?' All the regions of the earth are *his* already; even the 'uttermost parts of the earth for a possession! *All* things were made by him, and *for* him! And he shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied.' For 'All nations whom thou hast made, *shall* come and worship before thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name; for thou (not '*us*') art great, and doest wondrous things; thou art God alone!!!'

In solemn sincerity, we advise these men, who pretend to teach others, to read their Bibles, and with uplifted hands, and humble hearts, implore God to reveal to them the glorious truths therein contained. No longer, we beseech you, *deny* the *will*, or *power* of God, to *save* mankind; and presumptuously, and in God's stead, pretend to the power of saving souls, of *giving* an inheritance to that God, '*of* whom, and *to* whom, and *through* whom, are *all* things.' To whom be glory, for ever. Amen.

* Quere. Howdoes it 'appear,' when the 'appeal' is made to the good people of New-York for money?

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR—

SIR—Wishing as I do the happiness and welfare of the whole family of the earth, and seeing so much strife and contradiction on religion, I beg leave, through the medium of your paper, to refer the careful examination of every candid reader to the following passages of Scripture, with a hope that some one will offer an opinion of what will ultimately be the condition of *every man*.

Genesis 12, 18, 22, and 28, chaps. Psalms 2, 22, 98, 101 and 104. Isaiah 11, 14, 25, 28, and 45. Matt. 3 and 18. Mark 14 and 15 Luke 3 and 19. John 1, 3, 4, 6, 10 and 12. Acts 2 and 3. Romans 5, 9 and 14. Galatians 4. Ephesians 1. Philippians 2. Colossians 1. First Timothy 2. 2d Timothy 1. Titus 2. Hebrews 2 James 1. Second of Peter 3. First General of John 2, 3 and 4. and Revelation 5. These few, out of the many prominent passages, have recently fallen under the serious consideration of

HUMANITY.

Note. It is presumed our correspondent's motive in introducing the above to the notice of the public, is, to solicit their particular attention to the several chapters referred to, as containing clear, and abundant testimony, in favour of the Universal goodness of our heavenly Father.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR—In my younger days I was taught to look on the Bible with such reverence, as to be induced to appeal to it on every emergency The primary reason of this was—The Bible was *then* generally believed to be the Book of God—The Book by which we are to prove our title to eternal life—The Book which those who claim to be ministers of the Gospel are to use as the man of their counsel, and the touchstone by which they are to test whatever they advance. Now, Mr. Editor, I, as well as many of my neighbours, and, I make no doubt, the public generally, will consider ourselves obliged to you, if you inform us, without reserve, whether this Book of books is *now* to be superseded by Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress?—My reason for making this inquiry is this: I have latterly been in the habit of attending to the holding-forth of a gentleman in Rose-Street Chapel, who appears truly alive to the greatness of *Christian's* character as it appears in the Pilgrim's Progress, when at the same time the Book of God is suffered to remain in the desk, to be occasionally used as an anvil whenever the good man's nerves become capable of now and then giving it a hearty thump.

GAMMA.

From Benedict's History of the Baptists.

'The greatest man, says Robinson, among the Baptists at the Reformation, was the celebrated, the amiable, the incomparable Dudith; a man to be held in everlasting remembrance, much for his rank, more for his abilities and virtue, but most of all for his love of liberty. Never, says the same writer, was a finer pen than that of Dudith. 'You contend,' says he to Beza, 'that Scripture is a perfect rule of faith and practice. But you are all *divided* about the sense of Scripture, and you have not settled who shall be *judge*. You have broken off *your* yoke, allow *me* to break *mine*. Having freed yourselves from the tyranny of popish prelates, why do you turn ecclesiastical tyrants *yourselves*, and treat others with barbarity and cruelty for only doing what you set them an *example* to do? You contend that your lay hearers, the magistrates, and not you, are to be blamed, for it is they who banish and *burn* for heresy. I know you make this excuse; but tell me, have not *you* instilled such principles into their ears? Have they done any thing more than put in *practice* the doctrine that *you* have taught them?

RETRIBUTION.

During the reign of Henry VIII in England, the Anabaptists were persecuted, and two of considerable eminence, namely, Joan Boucher, (commonly called Joan of Kent,) and George Van Pare, a Dutchman, were committed to the flames. It is related that 'a person, supposed to be Fox, the author of the book of Martyrs, earnestly entreated the famous John Rodgers, who was afterward burnt at Smithfield, to use his interest with the Archbishop to save the poor woman from the cruel death to which she had been doomed. But Rodgers answered, that burning alive was no cruel death, but was *easy enough*. Fox, astonished at such an answer, replied, '*Well, perhaps it may so happen that you yourselves shall have your hands full of this mild burning.*' And so it came to pass; for Rodgers was the first man who was burned in Queen Mary's reign.'

Ibid.

Persecutions by the Church of Rome.

'On the fatal night of St. Bartholomews, August 24th, 1572—about 70,000 persons were murdered in Paris, in the most barbarous manner, by the influence of the Pope, and by the instrumentality of the blood-thirsty Charles IX. Within 30 years, there were murdered in France, 39 princes, 148 counts, 234 barons, 147,513 gentlemen, and 760,000 persons of inferior rank in life, but whose blood equally called for justice. 900,000 of these were murdered in a few years, by that furious Catholic, Charles IX.

In the short reign of the infamous Mary, in England, 277 were burnt, for their religious opinions.

Forty thousand perished in the Irish massacre in 1641.

In a very short time, there were hanged, burned, buried alive, and beheaded, 50,000 persons in the Netherlands.

The single order of the Jesuits alone, are computed, in the space of forty years, to have put to death 900,000 Christians, who deserted from popery. And the Inquisition, the bloody instrument of papal vengeance, in the space of thirty years, destroyed by various torture, 150,000!" *Ibid.*

Reader, these accounts, dreadful as they are, are fragrant as the perfumes of Arabia, compared with the declarations and descriptions of modern Zealots, who talk, not of the massacre, and momentary sufferings of thousands, but of *countless millions burning for ever!!!*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A. C. Enclosing 'Unitarians Appeal,' &c. Savin, Reprehensor, and Edw. Sharman are received.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY AT 3$ PER ANNUM. PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1821. NO. 44.

REVELATION XIV. 11.

"And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name."

The request of our correspondent, that we should give an exposition of this passage with its connexion, we cannot comply with at present in that extensive manner which may have been expected. The many calls and requests from other correspondents, must be our apology. We consider the most prominent feature of this chapter, is the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and the changes and events consequent thereupon. We say the most prominent, as being distinctly alluded to, and agreeing in figure with the parables of our Lord describing the same event, which took place a short time after the preaching of the gospel by the apostles, which event we conceive is distinctly alluded to in the 6th verse. The 7th verse, 'Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come,' we presume to be parallel with Acts xvii. 30, &c., 'And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent.' And with 1 Peter, iv. 17, &c., 'For the time *is come* that judgment must begin at the house of God; and if *it* first *begin* at us, what shall the end *be* of them that obey not the gospel of God?' The *beast* and his *image*, we have recently in Number 41, considered as *anti*, opposed to the salvation of God for a fallen world, and is confined to partial election of a few, and reprobation of the remainder, and the Pharasaical heresy of salvation being conditional on the works of the creature, &c. The reader, by comparing Matt. xiii. 39. 'The harvest is the end of the *world*,' (αιωνος, *age*) and xxiv. 30. 'And they shall see the Son of man coming in the *clouds* of heaven;' with the 14th and 15th verses of this chapter, will see their connexion, &c.

The 12th verse reads thus—'Here is the patience of the saints,' &c. What is the *patience* of the saints? Ans. 13th verse, 'And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me; Write, (What?) Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, (When?) from henceforth.' From the commencement of the preaching of the Gospel by the apostles, all who believed in Christ the Saviour of the world, died blessed. The declaration of Simeon is illustrative of this. 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in *peace*, for mine eyes *have* seen thy salvation.' As if he had said, 'Lord, by showing me Christ, thou hast enabled me to depart in peace.' Not let me die, because I have seen him, but thou now *lettest*, or enablest me *to* die in *peace*, by showing me thy *salvation*. Previous to this time, many prophets and righteous men, looking forward to the promised advent of Christ, *longed* to see that day, but were not blessed as Simeon, and all believers since that time have been, for they die emphatically in the Lord, or in faith, believing that he has come.

We are instructed at the 10th verse, that the worshippers of the beast shall 'drink of the wine of the wrath of God, &c., and be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb.' Christ, the Lamb of God, is now present in his Mediatorial kingdom, judging every man according to his works. The holy angels, are his messengers of truth, preaching his gospel, which duty figuratively speaking, makes them holy, as they are proclaiming holy things. As it is written—'How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!' In this gospel day, therefore, Antichristian worshippers are tormented in the presence of the Lamb, &c., who is visible to the eye of faith, in the 'gospel of peace,' which is 'glad tidings of good things.' 'And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever.' It is very remarkable that these Antichristian worshippers, who alone are *tormented*, should so earnestly contend that this (their) torment will never end! And this would indeed be passing strange, were it not for the fact that they intend their 'relatives, their children, and dearest connexions, shall be the subjects of it, instead of themselves! Pitying their condition, and wishing to afford them all the consolation in our power, (as they will not believe the truth, the extent of salvation) we shall attempt to convince them that *their* torment will shortly cease, and they be blessed with that heaven, which they, like their prototypes, the Pharisees of old, will not enter themselves, nor suffer others to go in. And first. The smoke of their torment ascendeth up *for ever* and *ever* (make it as *long* as you please,) and they have no rest *day* nor *night*, (day and night, of course, must alternately succeed each other *for ever* and *ever!*) who worship the beast and his image.' Consequently, they must worship the beast *for ever* and *ever!* For it is only those who, in the *present* tense, *worship* the *beast*, who *are* in the *present* tense *tormented!* But it is declared, that 'All nations whom God hath made shall (in the *future* tense) come and worship before *him*, and glorify his name, (not the *beast*, nor his image,) and all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord,' &c.

Reader, does αιωνας αιωνων mean an *endless* duration? If so, why did our learned and pious translators render the same word *ages*, in 1 Colos. 26. which is a fact? Will there be day and night, or will the *sun rise and set in hell?* In that hell, to describe which, all the arcana of Pluto's gloomy regions is brought forward, and the wild vagaries and delusions of idolatrous Pagans pressed into the service, and introduced as arguments and proof by modern Theologians?

Communication.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR—In one of your late Numbers you gave an extract from *Benedict's History of the Baptists*, showing the implacability of John Calvin's disposition, and the hand he had in Servetus's Martyrdom. I have often heard the account strenuously denied by Calvinists. I, therefore, send you the following, which cannot be questioned with decency, taken from Southey s life of Wesley, 2d vol. p. 89. Duyckinck's Edition 'Being (says Wesley) in the Bodleian Library, I lighted on Mr. Calvin's account of the case of Michael Servetus, several of whose letters he occasionally inserts, wherein Servetus often declares in terms, 'I believe the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.' Mr. Calvin, however, paints him such a monster as never was: An Arian, a blasphemer, and what not, besides strewing over him his flowers of *dog, devil, swine*, and so on, which are the usual appellations he gives his opponents. But still he utterly denies his being the cause of Servetus's death. 'No,' says he, '*I only advised our magistrates, as having a right to restrain heretics by the sword, to seize upon and try that arch-heretic;* but after he was condemned I said not one word about his execution.'

Again, In the same page Wesley says, "That Michael Servetus was 'one of the wildest Anti-Trinitarians that ever appeared,' is by no means clear. I doubt of it on the authority of Calvin himself, who certainly was not prejudiced in his favour. For, if Calvin does not misquote his words, he was no Anti-Trinitarian at all. Calvin himself gives a quotation from one of his letters, in which he expressly declares, 'I do believe the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; but I dare not use the word *Trinity*, or *person*.' dare, (says Wesley) and I think them very good words; but I should think it very hard to be burnt alive for not using them, especially with a slow fire, made of moist green wood. I believe Calvin was a great instrument of God; and that he was a wise and pious man; but I cannot but advise those who love his memory, to let Servetus alone."

It seems that the most rigid Calvinists inherit their oracle's bloody disposition, as well as his religious creed. Take the following as an instance, from the same work, vol. 2. p. 111.

When Wesley was in Scotland, (that hot-bed of Calvinism) 'an old Burgher Minister at Dalkeith preached against him, affirming that, if he died in his present sentiments, he would be damned; and the fanatic declared, that he would stake his own salvation upon it. It was well for him that these people were not armed with temporal authority.' 'The Seceders,' says Wesley, 'who have fallen in my way, are more uncharitable than the Papists themselves.' I never yet met a Papist who *avowed* the principle of murdering heretics. But a seceding minister being asked, 'Would not you, if it was in your power, cut the throats of all Methodists?' replied directly, 'Why, did not Samuel hew Aga in pieces before the Lord?"

In the same page is recorded the following *amiable trait of Calvinism.* A Methodist one day comforted a poor woman, whose child appeared to be dying, by assuring her that, for an infant, death would only be the exchange of this miserable life for a happy eternity; and the seceder, to whose flock she belonged, was so shocked at this doctrine, that the deep-died Calvinist devoted the next sabbath to the task of convincing his people, that the souls of all non-elect infants were doomed to certain and inevitable damnation!'

If this be gospel, I want none of it, but I most heartily thank God, that my Bible informs me, He is loving to every man, and hateth nothing that he has made.

GAMMA.

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS.

The Scriptures of Holy Inspiration inform us, that 'God is good to *all*, and his *tender* mercies are over *all* his works;' are we not, therefore, justified in concluding, that an *unchangeable* God will *always* be 'good to *all?*' and that his *tender* mercies will *always* be over *all* his works? Is it adviseable to cultivate that disposition which will tamely hear the God of the whole earth calumniated, and designs and purposes ascribed to him, which are diametrically opposite to the character which he has revealed of himself in the Scriptures, that '*He is Love*,' and at the same time, resent with indignation and fury, whatever is in our opinion derogatory to our own, or the characters, principles, and purposes of men, or any man, or those of any particular sect whatever?

Is it a fact, that in our day, a man is more liable to censure, and actually receives more crimination and reproach, for contending for the *goodness* and *mercy* of God, to *all*, than him who contends for the mercy of God to only a *part?*

Is it likewise a fact, that a man is exposed to, and actually has blame attached to him, for declaring and maintaining, that God is *immutable*, and that 'neither life, nor death, nor things *present*, nor things to *come*, &c., shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord?' when instead of blame, he would be *praised*, did he contend, that *death*, and 'things to *come*, would separate us *from* the *love* of God;' and that God would, from being our *friend*, change to an implacable and eternal *foe?* Brethren, are these things *so?* 'They ought not *so* to *be!*'

AT a Meeting of the Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth, *held Feb.* 2, 1821.

An Address was delivered by Brother Henry Fitz: Whereupon the Society unanimously voted him their thanks, and requested that the same be published in the Gospel Herald.

Extract from the Minutes,

J. HALL, Secretary.

ADDRESS.

BRETHREN,

"UNITED WE STAND—DIVIDED WE FALL," is a position, which has been sanctioned by the wisdom, and proved by the experience of ages. And the increase of individual exertion, and extension of individual efforts in their effects, is necessarily in a corresponding ratio with the increase of individual power, which depends of necessity upon a union of sentiment, of interest, and of action.

Union is strength. The apostolic injunction, "Brethren watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men; be of one mind, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might; preach the word, be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine;" is, if obligatory upon any at the present day, upon us, who profess to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. We believe our candle is the candle of the Lord, and lighted with the Spirit of Divine Truth. Let us not put it under a bushel, but rather in the house, that it may give light to all. Wisdom, says the wise man, is justified of her children. And who among you, having lost a piece of money, would not search diligently until you had found it, and when you had found it, rejoice, saying, I have found that which was lost. You have searched, and have found it. You have rejoiced. How many of our brethren of Adam's race have searched, and are still searching in vain, for the treasure which you have found, guided by blind guides, and deceived by those, who pretending to instruct, are themselves in blindness and ignorance.

Our Lord, whom we profess to imitate and obey, has set us an example, and given us a precept. He not only went about doing good—dispensing the bread of life—but he died, that we might live. And his declaration, "And if any *man* come to me and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple;" is, although figurative in expression, emphatic in its import. The food we eat, the clothes we wear, and the houses which shelter us, however great their value as auxiliaries to the well-being and comfort of the body, can never satisfy the longings of an immortal mind. And our own experience, if we walk in the path of duty, will act as an useful guide, and, on the other hand, will punish our aberrations. Figure to yourselves the wretch, poor and naked, suffering all the ills that life is heir to, and his prospects as barren of happiness, as his wants are prolific in suffering,—see him accosted by a stranger,—he listens, believes, and rejoices,—he is told, You are no longer poor—your sufferings are at an end—you have a Father who is waiting to receive you; the fatted calf is killed; his fingers are decked with rings, and in the place of nakedness and rags, he is covered with a flowing robe.

This is a faint picture of what was once our own poverty. We were spiritually poor, and blind, and naked;—we heard, believed, and rejoiced. What we *once* were, millions *now* are. There is enough for all;—we have no excuse. The patrimony of our Father will never be lessened by division; nor our shares, by the participation of all our brethren. Let all, therefore, be informed of their title to this inheritance;—let us "go into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that our Father's house may be filled." And since our lines are fallen to us in a pleasant place, and our means of accomplishing much, with little danger or trouble, compared with our brethren of the apostolic age, how culpable should we be, and how unworthy of our calling, if we were to grudge of labour, of our abundance, and of money, what our apostolic brethren *freely* gave of toilsome suffering, and from their little—and paid in prison, and at the scaffold, with their blood!

The motive which originated the request to assemble this evening, is threefold;—to unite our means and efforts—to extend the knowledge of the truth we rejoice in—and to provide a fund in future for this Society, which will increase the means of its members, by a unity of interest, heightened by the prospect of mutual benefit, in the extensive dissemination of the truth through a direct channel to the public, which will form the strongest tie and bond of connexion, in the certainty of our usefulness, and our duty to persevere. These objects are too momentous, to fail of exciting a corresponding interest; and too easy of attainment, to discourage those who feel sensibly their duty to persevere in well-doing.

The necessity of union, as a means to accomplish any thing with certainty, is a truth, which the experience of every man will abundantly manifest. Individual exertions may produce individual benefit; but experience will not justify, nor history produce examples, sufficient to authorize the expectation of great effects, from causes comparatively small. And those instances which might be adduced, of individuals bearing down opposition, and apparently rising to power or eminence in their professions, the latent cause would be found, not so much in their exertions and merits, as in the prejudices, passions, and interested motives of those who became their coadjutors.

To flatter the vanity, gratify the passions, and favour the prejudices of mankind, have in all ages been the stepping stones to power, to popularity, and to fame. And even in these instances, circumstances unseen, unsought, and uncontrolled, have effected more than prudent foresight could plan, or perseverance execute. The cause in which we are engaged, can never be forwarded by these helps. We flatter no vanities—we grant no license to the gratification of the passions—and so far from favouring, we wage war with the prejudices of the world! There is, therefore, two reasons in particular, which are of sufficient importance, independent of any other considerations, to operate with a force, at least in some measure commensurate with their importance and magnitude. Our number is small, and our labour is great;—union will increase the one, and lessen the other.—And when the object to be obtained, is greater than individual exertions can accomplish, an end, worthy the efforts of all, may be sacrificed, and individual exertions and losses may be sustained, and little or nothing effected; when the same exertions, had they been simultaneous in time, and united in their operation, would have effected all that the most ardent could desire, or the most interested expect.

The history of man has been a history of outrage, of faction, and of war. Instead of uniting their means for the welfare of all, they have formed combinations for their mutual destruction and misery. And even in this, our highly-favoured day and generation, and under the peaceful illumination of the light of the gospel of peace, rancour, and hatred, and every evil passion which blindness and ignorance can foster, and revenge inspire, under specious names, and deceitful guises, stalk like spectres from their dark abodes, and brothers welter in brothers' blood!

Do we see the cause of these disorders and miseries? Are we in possession of a recipe which can alleviate? Can we discover an antidote which will cure? Nay, more, have we ourselves been afflicted, and experienced the misery of the disease, and the blessings of healthful recovery, and are we in different for the fate of others? Have we forgotten the pain of uncertainty—the sickness of hope deferred—the fears of disappointment—the indescribable torment nursed by anxiety, and nourished by unbelief—that state, which dares not hope, and hates, yet has to fear;—whose expectations were gendered in darkness, the fruit of mistake, and the victim of despair;—when clouds black as hell, brooded over futurity, and gloomy horror steeped the soul in terrors—when no response breathed to quell the solicitude of immortal longings, but all was silent as death, dark as the grave, and cruel as uncertainty? What circumstance of time, or place, can obliterate from your memories the radiance of that morning, whose dawn chased away the clouds—the bright effulgence of whose Sun, bursting upon the soul, dispelled the night of death, and "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

What can efface from your minds the meridian glory of that faith, which, by anticipation, leaps the barrier of time, unravels the mysteries of eternity, and rests, with hope and charity, on scenes yet to be revealed; when all things shall be subdued, and God be all in all!—when love shall pervade every heart, devotion fill every soul, and rapture tune every tongue;—when sin, death, and hell, shall be buried in the grave of annihilation, and their remembrance lost in the splendours, the glories, and the triumphs of eternity! At the recollection of these, a recollection surpassing the powers of description to portray—a recollection, when every faculty of the soul is roused, and with undivided voice proclaims, "that neither life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord!"

Let these inspirations of gratitude, the fruit of faith, and the offspring of heaven-born charity, expand every heart. Let every energy of the soul be awakened to the magnitude of the cause we are engaged in, and to the reflection, that our own blessedness here cannot be circumscribed by any rule, but by the measure with which we mete out blessings to others.

"UNITED WE STAND—DIVIDED WE FALL." This sentiment, aided by the injunction of our brethren of the apostolic days, "Brethren, be of one mind," speaks volumes in support of the necessity of union in faith, in interest, and in action.

Our cause is the cause of a world! The passions and prejudices which sit at the helm, and too often guide and mislead the various contending sects, which distract mankind with their contentions, can *never* be identified with our *faith*, and must never be discovered in our practice.

Our predominant passion must be love for all men, for all are our brethren. And our prejudices be restricted to a jealousy and circumspection over ourselves, and confined to a distrust of our own judgment, and exercised in a dislike of, and reprimanding our own imperfections and inactivity! "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren," is the injunction of Him whom we profess to regard as our Lord, and whose commands should be to us the law of our life, while his example alone is the standard of our actions. The gospel God preached to Abraham, saying, "In thy Seed (Christ) shall all the families of the earth be blessed," is the only gospel we know, or believe: and the faith of Abraham, who *believed God*, is the faith, and the only faith we acknowledge; for it is the faith of *Him* "who was delivered for our offences, and rose again for our justification."

This is our faith. We are one! To extend the knowledge of this faith, which we believe and rejoice in, is our duty—should be our pleasure—and will, if we are faithful over our house, promote our happiness. The considerations which press this duty upon the mind, are various, and important. A sense of duty; the happiness of our brethren, who are now groping in darkness, or agonizing with suspense; and even interest, which too often is paramount to, and takes place of, all others, are the most prominent; and each, independent of the others, is sufficient, if calmly and seriously considered, to interest and rouse our feelings, and secure an attention commensurate with its merits. If we measure our duties by our obligations, and gratitude is permitted to preside as umpire in the case, they will indeed swell to an enormous magnitude. While, on the other hand, if we, like the unprofitable servant, bury our talent in the earth, we may graduate our principles upon the scale of mistaken interest, and bury our virtues, our duties, and our joys, in the grave together. "He who spake as never man spake," declared, that "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."

The Christian is a soldier in the cause of Christ. And when the Captain of our salvation, who has all power in heaven and in earth, has taken the lead, it would be treason of the blackest hue to quit the ranks; and cowardice, disgraceful and criminal beyond conception, to flinch, or turn our backs to an enemy! If we, therefore, take counsel of our duty, there are claims upon us, which, however easy they may be in compliance, are imperiously binding and obligatory in their observance. And although the joys of heaven, and an eternity of bliss, is a boon far greater than mortals can acquire, still, while truth or error, without alternative, improves the joys, or poisons the peace of man, man can be friend and bless his fellow-man. Salvation is the gift of God. It is secured *in* Christ for all, whether Jew or Gentile, bond or free. But man, ignorant of the purposes of mercy which his heavenly Father has in store for a fallen world, and distrusting the goodness of God, is seeking death in the error of his ways, and *losing* his life, where he in vain attempts to *find* it. The blind are leaders of the blind, until they both fall into the ditch. If virtue is its own reward, there is ample room for its exercise: and if vice is its own punisher, there is enough of suffering seen in the misery of its recipients, to deter from the example. And if there is any analogy between cause and effect, a sufficient reason can be readily assigned for the miseries of the religious; and the vail which prejudice and passion have disfigured and disguised with names and characters, is seen through and detected.

That religion which makes miserable, is the deception of devils, the science of hell! And that religion which shuts for ever the portals of heaven to all but a *favoured few*, would suffer by comparison with India's blood-stained creed,—

> Would crowd the courts of Pluto's black abodes,
> And mercy's palm consign to heathen gods:
> Would make Jehovah's oath, to Abra'am given,
> The sport of hell—the misery of heaven.
> Would from the Saviour's brow the laurel tear,
> And merge in endless night fam'd Beth'lem's star;
> And heavenly peace, by blood of Jesus won,
> By hell's grim tyrant scorn'd, and trod upon!
> Divided empire held—But he in heaven,
> How few his train, compar'd with curst Abaddon.

"How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things; that say unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!" To proclaim these glad tidings unto our brethren is our duty, and should be our business and pleasure. To declare that God reigneth—that he will judge the earth righteously, and the people with truth, must indeed be pleasant to those, who, enlightened by the wisdom which is from above, know that all men have righteousness in God, and that "Christ is the way, the *truth*, and the life."

Our Lord and Master has declared, that the "servant who knoweth his master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." We have professed to know our Master's will—To know that his will is, "That all men shall be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." Shall we not proclaim this will of our Father to his children, who, ignorant of his purpose towards them, and led by blind guides, are stumbling upon the dark mountains of death? What is there in reason or revelation, which will justify such conduct; which will authorize the putting the candle under the bushel, and hiding the talent in the earth? There is nothing! Our Lord has declared—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." Were you languishing on beds of sickness, and did your neighbour possess a remedy which would infallibly heal your disease, and restore you to health and happiness, would you not wish to be made acquainted with it, and be blessed with its application? How many, at this moment, are afflicted with mental suffering, and languishing beneath the terrors of futurity; dreading imaginary evils, and blind to real good? You possess the remedy—You know its virtues, for you have experienced its efficacy! "Whatsoever, therefore, ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them, for this is the law and the prophets." To profess with our mouth that we regard all men as our brethren, and at the same time prove by our conduct that we are strangers to, and indifferent for, their welfare, would be conduct disgraceful in its nature, and incompatible with the faith we confess. To declare the solicitude we feel for all men—that all should come to the knowledge of the truth, and to withhold that truth, and refuse to extend to them the knowledge which has been communicated unto us,—if we did not deserve the appellation of enemies, we should be far from meriting the name of friends.

Our duty and interest are inseparably connected. And independent of the honours and distinctions of this world, which, from their uncertain duration, and dissatisfaction in possession, are comparatively unworthy the name, an interest of far greater moment demands our attention; and, if we are wise, will influence our conduct, and govern our decisions. It is the continual and pleasing reflection, that we "have fought the good fight; have kept the faith;" and, when we shall have "finished our course," we shall look beyond the fleeting things of time and sense; our hopes, quickened to certainty, we shall, without reproach, receive the crown of righteousness, which Christ, the righteous Judge, will give us at that day.

The scoffs of the infidel may comport with the hour of revelry and merriment—the indifference of the thoughtless may be nourished for a time, by the bustle and pleasures of the world—and the boasting of the Pharisee may last, while the arrogance of competition swells his bosom; but it is for him, and him alone, whose faith has been strengthened by exercise, which "works by love and purifies the heart," who can "finish his course" rejoicing, and with unclouded eyes, and believing heart, meet the grim tyrant, Death, and undismayed enter that country,

> "From whose bourn no traveller returns!"

Are honours and distinctions our object? Where can honour be found, which will bear competition for a moment with the honour of him, who is faithful to his Father and his God? And what distinction so enviable, as that of being acknowledged children of him, who is King of kings, and Lord of lords?

Are riches our aim? What are the toys of a moment—the bauble which glitters, and disappears—the desire of fools, and the curse of the miser, compared with an inheritance beyond the stars, which is incorruptible, and fadeth not away—to be heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ, in a possession extensive as space, and eternal as eternity?

Is pleasure our pursuit? What pleasure can equal the joys which thrill through the bosom, and exalt to rapture the heart of him who sees the prodigal return? Who witnesses the outcast, so long a stranger and forlorn, return to happiness and heaven! The wanderer, who strayed in the maze of error and unbelief, until hope sickened to dissolution, and expectation perished in doubt, brought home to the house of his Father, triumphing in salvation, and chanting the praises of redeeming love.

How emphatic, and peculiarly appropriate, is the exhortation of the apostle, "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the

power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high *places*." We, therefore, are soldiers in the cause of Christ, who is the Captain of our salvation: and the nature of the armour mentioned by the apostle, is descriptive of our duties. For our *defence*, we are commanded to have our "loins girt about with truth," and to have on the "breastplate of righteousness;" our "feet to be shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;" and, "above all, to take the shield of faith, whereby we shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked." For *offence*, helmed with salvation, we are to take the "sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." Are we accoutred in this impenetrable armour, and have we made a stand? Have we fought the good fight? Or have we intrenched ourselves behind the ramparts, which fear, or the "god of this world" has erected, and eluded our duty? What multitudes have flocked to the standards of earthly princes, and sacrificed life and limb, to obtain that thing called honour, and contended with arms and armour, as delusive as their cause was criminal? And shall we want incentives to action? We, whose armour is impenetrable as adamant, and whose weapons are sharper than any two-edged sword—whose cause is the cause of a world, having justice for its foundation—the happiness of the universe for its object, and Omnipotence for its support? Is the bounty offered too inconsiderable to procure enlistments? Are the wages too low, and is the service too dishonourable to stimulate to action? What cause can be assigned for the apathy which prevails, even in the minds of those who confess their faith in Christ, and acknowledge him for their Lord and Master? How many are compassing sea and land to make proselytes to error, propagate the doctrines of men, and spread the delusions of the adversary? Can it be possible, that error is more powerful, and possesses greater attractions, than the truth? To what cause shall these appearances be attributed? and how long shall they be permitted to exist, to the disgrace of our professions, and to the misery and delusion of mankind?

There never was a position more pregnant with falsehood, than the hypothesis which at present is so general, as to be the Shibboleth of millions, and the passport to confidence and honour—a position, which makes the *misery* of one man necessary and accessory to the *happiness* of another! And there never was a truth more self-evident, and attested by nature, reason, and revelation, than the fact, that the happiness of *all* is necessary for the happiness of *each!* To prove this, it is only necessary for every man to lay his hand upon his heart, and, in sincerity, answer the following questions: Can that man possess a disposition susceptible of the *love* of Christ, and of happiness, who can look upon *misery* without feeling a *desire* to relieve it? And can that man be said to be happy, who has *one* desire ungratified? No, he cannot!

Let infuriate zealots attest their love by their *insensibility*, and indifference to the welfare of their brethren,—Let Pharisees, whose imaginations are crazed to produce an inversion of the laws of nature, and whose boasted qualifications would, in practice, fall short of the tenderness of the *tigress* for her progeny—let them raise their eyes, and lift their hands in prayer, and say, "Father in heaven, regard *us* as we regard *others*"—let their prayers be answered—let the divine, eternal rule of justice measure them—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them," and they, who, if they can be believed, are of all men the *last* to pity, would be the *first* to need it! Let us, therefore, brethren, who have ranged under the banner of the King of heaven, the Saviour of the world; let us "fight the good fight." Let us remember, that the life of a soldier is a life of activity; that he must never desert his post while an enemy is in sight; nor value his life more than his honour, his cause, or his commander! The faith we confess is continually assailed by foes on all sides: and we can never agree to an armistice, without a false acknowledgment of our weakness, or betraying a partiality for the cause of the enemy! The battle must end only with life. And if our present welfare was incompatible with it, we should never have been required to lift our hand, or move a finger in the combat!

However true it may be, that our eternal well-being is independent of ourselves, and that our salvation is the gift of God, it is not less true, that our present peace depends upon our faith in God, and our belief of this fact. Faith in this life, therefore, is the only medium and cause of peace and joy in the salvation of God. And in proportion as the exercise of our faith is a mean of keeping our faith, in that proportion are we benefited by its exercise, and injured by our inactivity. And since our heavenly Father has made it our duty to *strengthen our brethren*, it is incontestably true, that our duty and happiness are inseparably connected; and that we cannot fail of reward in obedience, or escape the consequence of disobedience. Here, then, is an appeal to our interest, independent of every consideration for the future. Our present happiness, to say nothing of the happiness of others, is affected and interested, in proportion as the mind of man is in want of food and sustenance, and is independent of, and dissatisfied with, the desires and attainments of the body. The idiot and the philosopher may feed at the same table, and rise from the repast with the same sensations and satisfaction. But, the mind of no man can feed upon *error*, and be satisfied; and it is a lamentable fact that but few have fed upon, and been satisfied, with the *truth*.

Impressed with these recollections, and convinced of these truths, what more can be necessary to induce us to manifest our faith by our works, and, according to our abilities, subserve the cause of truth, of God, and humanity.

The cause we advocate, is of such importance, that in comparison, the common concerns of men dwindle into insignificance, when put in competition with it. It is the cause of God; it should be the cause of all men. Put in competition with it, I consider the honours, distinctions, and pompously empty and unsatisfying pretensions of this present state, as less "than a drop in the bucket."

Individual exertions are unequal to the task. And however justly we may reckon upon the assistance and blessing of heaven upon our efforts, still, unless we unitedly make use of the means already bestowed upon us, heaven in justice, and mercy too, may remove our candlestick from our house, and illuminate others, who will be disposed to extend its revivifying beams to their brethren who are groping in the darkness of error.

I consider this Society capable of doing much; and its members and influence will increase, in proportion to the magnitude of the object it has in view. Therefore, let it be identified with every principle which can be interesting to men, in all the concerns of the Christian character; for *it is impossible to do our duty, without reaping a rich reward in the satisfaction afforded by the smiles of an approving conscience!*

Brethren, our cause is the cause of the UNIVERSE! Let every nerve be strained to its utmost tension—let every fibre be a willing coadjutor in this work of reformation—and then, should error predominate, we can lay our hand upon our heart, and say, WE ARE GUILTLESS!

ARMINIANISM.

'The work of pardon on the conscience is called *justification;*—the work of holiness in the heart, is termed *sanctification;*—these *two* comprise the whole of salvation of the soul in this world. He who is *completely sanctified*, or cleansed from *all sin*, and dies *in* this *state*, is fit for glory.'

Reader, this is the declaration, and creed, of our Methodist Friends. Now we should be glad to know what prophet, or apostle, 'calls,' and 'terms' the above '*justification*,' and '*sanctification;*' and that 'these *two* comprise the *whole* of salvation,' &c. An apostle has said, 'I am justified by the faith of *Christ!*' Again, that 'Christ by himself purged our sins, &c. and hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' We think our Methodist Friends are committing a gross error; for if it were admitted, that according to their view the man is 'sanctified by the work of holiness in the heart,' still they contradict the apostle, because they declare a man can be sanctified and *fall* away, and go to hell for ever, at last. Now we are quite willing to acknowledge, that, according to the Methodist manner of sanctifying, a man may fall away and be damned! according to the express meaning of the word, condemned—we think their *dying* in a state so very *slippery*, that their stability depends, not so much upon their holiness and sanctification, as on their dying, and by that means getting clear of temptation to sin, and fall away, proves a little too much for them. If they happen to die, while they are in this *good mood*, they are safe. But, should they happen to live a little longer, they may sin, and fall into endless misery and wretchedness. How is this? Is it because there is no change *after* death? That is, no making sinners any *better;* and all holy, will remain holy, and all filthy, will remain filthy? Let it be remembered, that these holy people are as much indebted to death, for their future happiness, as to their sanctification, or justification, for they are always in danger of *falling* away, to the last moment of their lives, so great is the *imperfection* of *their sanctification*—nay more, they will not be changed *after* death; consequently, they must remain imperfect for ever! Now mark the difference between the Methodists, or Arminian sanctification, and the sanctification of Christ. The Methodist, however sanctified he may be, is 'in danger of falling as long as he lives'—But Christ hath perfected for ever them that *he* hath sanctified! The conclusion is inevitable. This justification, and sanctification is not *of* Christ; for 'he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.'

It is worthy of remark, that the Methodist who made this declaration, that 'these *two* comprise the whole of salvation in this world,' (and we think they should, to be consistent, have added the *other* world too,) has not said one word about *faith*, either as cause or effect!

'The blind are leaders of the blind, until they both fall into the ditch.'

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1821. NO. 45.

Controversial.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SALVATION.

There is no subject we can be more interested in, than that of the salvation of the soul. It is therefore a matter of importance that we should be well informed of what salvation is, and who may be considered the subjects of it.

With regard to salvation there are now two opinions prevailing in the Christian church, viz. *one* limiting salvation to a *part* only of the human race, and the *other* extending it to *all*. The first of these opinions has its origin among a part of the Christian world, in what are called the decrees of God, whereby he has foreordained from the beginning whatsoever comes to pass, and so has appointed a part of mankind, who are called the *elect*, to eternal salvation, and the rest he has passed by without concern, and left to perish in eternal torments for ever. Another part of Christendom, though they believe in the salvation of a part only of mankind, yet do not believe that this is the result of any arbitrary determination on the part of the Almighty. But that God having prescribed to mankind the terms and conditions of his admission into heaven, it is of his own choice whether he will, by complying with these terms and conditions, make himself the subject of the blessing; or by neglecting to comply with the terms, shut himself out from its enjoyment. The second opinion prevailing on this subject, is called *Universal Salvation*, and has its origin in those attributes of the Almighty, called goodness, wisdom, and power. The doctrine of decrees, it is hoped, is already sufficiently exploded.

The opinion which annexes terms and conditions to God's exercise of his mercy, is considered by its opponents, as inconsistent with his attributes, but by its supporters, as a rational scheme of rewards and punishments. The Universalists' scheme, it *must be confessed*, is more consonant with the *Divine goodness* and mercy; but yet it is utterly inconsistent with the character of man.

The *conditional scheme*, and *the Universalists' scheme*, are what I purpose to consider. The first I believe to be true; but, as generally held, stands on a false foundation.

But first, we will consider what salvation is. It is admitted, that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of mankind, and that he is called the Saviour, because 'he saves his people from their sins.' The true definition then, of the term *salvation*, as deduced from the above admitted fact, must be '*liberation from sin;*' that is, from 'the power and dominion of sin.'

The question then occurs, *How* is man saved from sin, or his sins? There is, I conceive, a very great difference between being saved from *sin*, and being saved from *the punishment* of sin. I will illustrate this; sin is said to be a violation of God's laws; and this violation of God's laws, is supposed to draw down upon man the penalty annexed by God to the violation of his laws; and that his justice will by no means allow of the mitigation of this penalty, without a satisfaction made for the offence. Now we are saved from the *punishment* of sin, that is, from the *penalty due* for the violation of God's laws, when satisfaction is made for such violation. And this is the salvation, if I understand it, which both the *conditional* and the *unconditional schemes* imply. But we are saved from *sin itself*, when from the renovation of our natures, we no longer violate God's laws. Then we are delivered from evil dispositions and inclinations. And this I conceive is what our Lord does, when he saves his people from their *sins*.

Thus, then, we have disclosed the error, both of Universalists and others. If salvation were only a deliverance from the *punishment* of sin, then I admit, that Universal Salvation is the true doctrine, according to the general belief, that Christ's death upon the cross was a vicarious sacrifice, and a satisfaction for God's violated laws. And the advocate for conditions must, I think, give up the point. But the truth is, Christ's sacrifice was *not* vicarious; nor was it a satisfaction made for God's violated laws. The idea of a vicarious sacrifice is formed wholly on the supposition, that salvation is from the *punishment* of sin, and not from *sin itself*. But we have seen that salvation is in reality a deliverance from *sin itself;* that is, from the power, dominion, or influence of evil dispositions, propensities and inclinations. It is not simply the *commission* of sin, the *actually* violating of God's laws, that is alone sinful; but it is the having the *desire* or *will* to do this, whether we do it or not, that is of the essence of sin, as our Lord saith, 'he that *looketh* on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart. The doctrine now, which supposes satisfaction was made by Christ for the violation of God's law, or for sin, supposes *actual* transgression, and not merely the *will* or *desire* to transgress. But how could such satisfaction, at all deliver a man from evil and wicked thoughts and desires? How could it deliver him from the *inclination* to transgress? And yet this is the only true *salvation*.

The assertion above that the death on the cross was *not vicarious*, nor was it a satisfaction made for God's violated laws, stands so directly opposed to the common ideas upon this subject, that it may perhaps be thought I ought to give some reasons for my opinion. The following, I think, ought to be satisfactory. In the first place, the idea of a vicarious sacrifice supposes that God is not a *merciful*, but *vindictive* Being. It is of *mercy* to *forgive;* but it is of *vengeance not to forgive*. Sin cannot be said to be *forgiven*, when a *satisfaction* is made for it, any more than a *penalty* can be said to be *remitted* when it is *paid*. In the next place, the idea of a vicarious sacrifice, supposes more than one Divine Being; which is an absurdity. And I cannot believe that the Scriptures teach absurdities. It is said, that Christ by the death on the cross, satisfied the Divine Justice. This satisfaction was made for God's violated law. But Christ himself was a Divine Being; nay, he was God himself, God with us. Now vicarious sacrifice implies, a person making the offering, and another person to whom the offering was made. In the present case, the person making the offering, and the person to whom the offering was made, are both *divine beings*, that is, are both gods; therefore, there are *two* gods. But suppose they are one, then the Divine Being makes satisfaction to himself. This is also absurd. Again, the idea of a vicarious sacrifice, supposes an *innocent* person, suffering for the sins of the guilty. This is contrary to all the laws we are acquainted with; *human* or *Divine*. I conclude, therefore, that the Scriptures cannot teach such monstrous doctrines. It is not taught by Christ; if it has been taught by others, let us not impute it to the *Divine teacher*, who only was the true one.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

We are fully of opinion with our correspondent, J. C. that the salvation of the soul is a subject of universal and unequalled concern; and that it follows as a consequence, that it is very important that we should be acquainted with its nature; but, here we pause—if there are any who are never to become its recipients, the *dreadful tidings*, however *late*, will be to them too *soon!*

J. C. in his *second* paragraph, considers *two* opinions as prevailing; the Calvinistic, and the Arminian; and we coincide with him, when he says, 'The doctrine of decrees, (we include reprobation,) it is hoped, is already sufficiently exploded.'

J. C.'s *third* paragraph is so very remarkable, we transcribe it entire—'The opinion which annexes terms and *conditions* to God's exercise of *his* mercy, is considered by its opponents, as inconsistent with his attributes: but by its supporters, as a rational *scheme* of rewards and punishments. *The Universalists' scheme, it must be confessed, is more consonant with the Divine goodness and mercy;* but yet it is utterly inconsistent with the character of man.' We are astonished, not that J. C. should concede what is self-evident, but that, after making the concession of the *premisses*, he should deny the unavoidable *conclusion!* Here are *two* positions—one is *conceded;* the other is *assumed*. Let us examine them. The *first*, is incontrovertible. The second, we shall *controvert;* then, the first is the truth, and the only, and whole truth! Our opinions, or the opinions of J. C., in this case, will not weigh a feather; and we forbear proving the truth of the *first*, only because it is conceded. The Universal and Unconditional salvation of man, is *more* consonant with the *goodness* and mercy of God, than the reverse, which is considered to be *conditional* salvation. Why? Ans. Because the first, however it may agree with the character and attributes of the Infinite Jehovah, is inconsistent with the character of finite man. Shall we consider it inconsistent, because man *deserves* to be saved on account of his own goodness and merits, and that it would be wronging him to ascribe his salvation wholly to the goodness and mercy of God, to the rejection of all his demands? What says the apostle? 'If it is of *works*, (conditional,) then it is no more *grace;* but, if it *is* of *grace*, (what then? What follows? Hear—) then, it is *no more works!*' But J. C. says, 'It is utterly inconsistent with the character of man.' Not so, says the apostle. We ask, What *is* the character of man? Reason, nature, and revelation answers—*man is a sinner!* What is salvation? J. C. shall answer—'Liberation from sin; that is, from the power and dominion of sin.' (See his *fourth* paragraph.) Where is the consistency, according to J. C.'s plan, in conditional salvation? Ans. If man will *first* 'liberate himself from the power and dominion of sin,' he shall be *saved*. Granted, for according to J. C.'s own definition, (and it is the truth,) man would then *have* saved himself, and Christ would have no part nor lot in the matter! Now it is conceded by all, that 'it is impossible for a thing to *be* and *not* to be *at* the same time.' And, vice versa, It is impossible for a thing *not* to be and to *be* at the same time. Now it must be admitted, that *if* 'the Universalists' scheme, is *more* consonant with the Divine goodness and mercy, but utterly inconsistent with the character of man,' then, the reverse, the Arminian scheme of *conditional* salvation, is more consonant with the character of man, but utterly inconsistent with the goodness and mercy of God! Here are the conclusions—what will you do with them? Admitting J. C.'s premisses were true, what then? Who shall give way? Who shall coerce Jehovah, to admit a *scheme* of salvation *inconsistent* with his goodness and mercy, that it may be consistent with *man's* character? How would reason decide? But the Scriptures are the only umpire, and they *must* decide. Rom. viii. 20, 21. 'For the creature (*ktisis* the creation) was made subject to vanity, not willingly, (gladly) but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope. Because the creature (*ktisis*) itself also *shall be delivered* (not deliver itself) from the bondage of corruption (*sin*) into the glorious liberty of the children of God.' Who shall deliver them? Ans. Christ. Proof. Heb. ii. 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part

of the same; that through death *he* (Christ) might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; *and deliver them* who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.' J. C.'s assumed position, therefore, is inconsistent with reason, and opposed to the plain declarations of Scripture. It therefore follows of necessity, that Universal, Unconditional salvation, is consonant with all the attributes of God, and consistent with the character of man, who is a sinner.

Having admitted J. C.'s definition of salvation, in his *fourth* paragraph, we proceed to his—

Fifth. Here we remark, that J. C. is too hasty in forming conclusions. We recommend to him, first, to understand our doctrine, before he undertakes to confute it. No longer class us with Arminian *schemers!* We have repeatedly declared our faith in the following—'His name shall be called Jesus, (Saviour) for *he shall save* his people *from* their sins.' Again—we believe there is a sin which is not, neither can be defined as a transgression of God's law, on any other principle, than admitting Jesus the Saviour to be the giver of that law; for that law requires no man to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, except the Lord Jesus Christ is the Lord Jehovah! We believe that mankind are reproved *of* sin, not *for*, not believing in Jesus; but *because*, they believe not *in* him. We consider this an obvious and important distinction. The following may serve to illustrate this. Paul said, 'I am justified by the faith of Christ.' What is the faith of Christ? Ans. It is the faith which was given to Abraham, who believed God, that 'in his seed (Christ) all the families of the earth shall be blessed.' The faith of Christ, therefore, is belief, proceeding from a certain knowledge of the designs of God, and their accomplishment. Christ, who had all power in heaven and in earth, was certain of the salvation of the world, to reconcile which he died, rose, and ascended into heaven! The man, therefore, who believes in the salvation of God for a fallen world, unconditional, universal, and secured in Christ the Head of every man, is not reproved of sin. Why? Ans. *Because* he believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of all men, who has redeemed him by his blood! To be explicit—we consider the word *reprove* defined by Christ, when he declared to the Jews, 'Ye shall die *in* your sins,' &c. So long as those Jews lived, they were reproved *of* sin, emphatically. *because* they believed not in the Lord Jesus Christ; but denied the merit of his atonement, and went about establishing their *own* righteousness, which was of the law, (which law continually *reproved* them of sin,) instead of the righteousness of God! Therefore, although men are reproved *of* sin, *for* not believing, yet the *cause* emphatically is, *because* they do not believe that Christ *has*, in his body, reconciled them to God on the tree!

J. C. commences his *sixth* paragraph, by declaring, 'Here then we have disclosed the error, both of Universalists and others.' Supposing J. C. had first proved, that we profess to believe salvation to consist in our being saved from *punishment*, and not from sin; we think it would have looked better. We declare once for all—We do not believe Christ died, or suffered to save any man from the punishment justly due for his sins. Every punishment and penalty denounced for a violation of God's law, will be inflicted, as much so, as though Christ had never died! And we challenge all men to prove, that the law ever threatened any but temporal punishments, or promised any but temporal blessings. Let it be remembered, that 'Life and immortality was brought to light through the *gospel!* The wages of sin is death, but the *gift* of God is eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ.' And Paul declares, that 'death hath passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.' Again—'Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil,' &c. So long as men *continue* to do evil, so long they will 'have tribulation and anguish.' And heaven be praised for it; but first prove that men will do evil for ever without end, and then it is conceded that they will have 'tribulation and anguish for ever without end! This, however, we deny. Relative to Christ's being the *vicarious* sacrifice, &c., we remark—we recollect of *once* making use of this term in the course of our remarks since the publication of this paper; (if we have used it oftener, we do not recollect it,) and it was an inadvertence, &c. It is well known to our readers, that we believe, agreeably to the Scripture account, that we are the 'members of the body of Christ, and that if *one* member suffer, *all* the members suffer with it.' And, that 'we were crucified *with* him—buried *with* him—and have risen *with* him—and sit in heavenly places *in* Christ Jesus.' In fine, that 'our life is hid with Christ in God;' and that by our union *with* our Divine Head, and Redeemer, we *were* partakers *with* him in his obedience, sufferings, death, and resurrection! This is our faith. And we are determined to *contend for it!* But, the moment we acknowledge that Christ was merely a *vicarious* sacrifice, (a substitute in our stead, and place, which is the express meaning of the term,) that moment we renounce in fact, (if not in form,) our *membership* with him, and make a rapid advance to the Calvinistic doctrine of an implacable, enraged, and vindictive God, and tacitly admit the conclusion, of the innocent suffering instead of the guilty! We have said, and we repeat it, *we mean to be consistent!* It is bad policy to introduce words of equivocal meaning; and we sincerely, and freely acknowledge, it is more objectionable still, to adhere to a phraseology palpably contradicting in expression, and confounding in its import. We are conscious, however, that many persons with the best motives may do this; and when it is considered that there is abroad in the religious world, a set of terms and phrases, which men have, as it were, sucked in with their mothers' milk, it is less a matter of astonishment than regret, that they are not *now* completely exploded. We, therefore, agree with J. C. that 'Christ's sacrifice was *not vicarious*, nor was it a *satisfaction* made for a violated law.' And we are ready to prove this, against *all* the objections which can be raised, from reason, nature, and revelation. What does the law *require?* Ans. *Perfect obedience!* What is its *penalty?* Ans. *Death!* Did Christ die that man might be preserved *from* death? Ans. No! For *all die.* What did Christ effect by his sacrifice, &c? Ans. He 'made *peace* through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile* all things unto himself, by him, whether things in earth, or things in heaven.' God is *unchangeable*, and always the Father, Friend, and Lover of his creatures. Man needed to be reconciled to his Father, God; not God to man. We likewise agree with J. C. that salvation is a deliverance from sin itself, in the most extensive sense of the word, even from every wrong desire and propensity. And we appeal to him, whether in this life, so long as we are in this 'bondage to corruption,' every man, without distinction, must not cry out in the language of the apostle, 'O wretched man that I am—Who shall *deliver me from this body of sin and death?*' And like him too, give 'thanks to God, who alone *giveth us the victory* through our Lord Jesus Christ!'

(*To be continued.*)

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

In No. 36, under the head of Punctilio, I observe 'that in *future* no manuscript found in the letter-box will be considered as a communication, or intended for publication, or will be published in the Gospel Herald, unless it is directed to the Editor of the Gospel Herald, or in the address the words Gospel Herald are expressed, and the declaration, that it is intended for publication in the *same* is directly expressed, &c.'

I would ask the Editor, whether this is not a little more nice than wise? Some of these Punctilios might be unintentionally omitted in manuscripts of importance to the cause of truth, when this trifle [for it is truly so to those who are not conscientious that things and their names are not strictly applicable] would be a bar to their publication. Whether it would not be better to rescind this Punctilio, that trifles may not hinder the free circulation of sentiments on religion, which, although they may not be infallible, yet if they are communicated in the good will which the Gospel inspires, will they not savour the righteous cause? And will not those who are mistaken in doctrinal points in religion, knowing only Apollos like the baptism of John, whose lives are in this good will, when they come to have the way of God more perfectly expounded, forego their preconceived sentiments, and gladly receive it?

Compare this Punctilio with the Prospectus of the Gospel Herald—

'The title affixed to this Prospectus is a brief exhibition of its contemplated contents. 'Jesus Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever,' is our only Counsellor, Pattern, and Guide. Antichrist, in all the Protean forms he may assume, our only enemy.'

Quere. Was this notice, under the head of *Punctilio*, inscribed by the council of Christ? Does the Spirit of Christ dictate, that the communication of a brother shall not be printed in the G. Herald, because he affirms his conscientious scruples in calling it the Gospel Herald?

Is this edict the fruit of the Spirit of Christ, which the apostle says, is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and temperance?

Is it Love that dictated this prohibition to a wounded conscientious brother? Is this prohibition the pouring in of the wine and oil of the salvation of our God, into the wounded hearts of our brethren of Adam's race, mentioned in the Prospectus? Is this prohibition the effect of joy, peace, long suffering? Truth, in the Prospectus, is declared to be the object; reason the means to obtain it; and the Scriptures the source from which alone it is to be obtained. Now let it be asked, what truth, what reason, and what Scripture could dictate the above-mentioned notice? Did reason and truth present the Herald to the public, and invite their patronage, and declared, that the columns of this paper will be open to all sects, and confined to none? Would not the columns of this paper remained open to all, notwithstanding the scruples of some as to its name? What spirit is that, which declares that no communication will be published in the G. Herald, unless it is directed to the Editor of the G. Herald, or in the address G. Herald is expressed? What does it savour, and what will be its tendency?

How does it comport with this remark in the Prospectus, 'No communication will ever be rejected by the Editor of this paper, provided it is couched in admissible terms, and even under exceptionable circumstances [personalities excepted] if the writer insists upon the publication of his sentiments, he shall be gratified on condition (not of calling this paper the G. Herald) but of publicly acknowledging them for his own.

Quere. Does the Editor now falsify his word, by rejecting in his notice in the 36th Number, all communications that are not directed to the Editor of the Gospel Herald, or in them that Gospel Herald is not expressed?

Look at his answer to W. Dean, No. 39, p. 160, compare motive therein expressed, with his Punctilio in No. 36, and quere how the truth stands affected?

Fellow correspondents, what think ye of this? Shall the Gospel Herald become a hiss, a by-word, and a reproach to the Christian cause which it professes to espouse for want of being dictated by the Spirit of truth? It really might be a very useful paper were all communications to emanate from this source, but in the same degree as there is a departure therefrom, what can we expect but frivolity, falsehood, and persecution one against another, or on account of different sentiments in religion? This is by no means the way to get along to edification.

Let sentiments be offered in simplicity, and with candour, and defended only in the spirit of meekness upon the ground of truth. In this disposition, we shall be as much disposed to see and be convinced of our own errors, as to see and convince others of theirs. 'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet and turn again and rend you,' that is, be careful to avoid giving what we have to communicate in holy things,

to a doggish spirit to utter. Neither cast such communications before those who are in the filthy rending spirit of swine, for in both cases the truth must suffer. But in the language of the apostle, let the weapons of our warfare (in the contending for truth, be in the spirit of it) be spiritual, mighty through God to the putting down the strong holds of sin and Satan in ourselves; then a hopeful success may be expected from our labours with others. But, so long as we suffer the beam to remain in our own eye, how can we see clearly to cast the mote out of our brother's eye? SAVIN.

ANSWER.

We recognize with pleasure the quotations from our 'Prospectus,' introduced by Savin;—'*Truth* is the object; *reason* the means to obtain it; and the *Scriptures*, the source, from which *alone* it is to be obtained. No communication will ever be *rejected* by the Editor of this paper, provided it is couched in *admissible* terms; and even under exceptionable circumstances (personalities excepted,) if the writer *insists* upon the publication of his sentiments, he shall be gratified on condition of publicly acknowledging them for his own.' Again—'Antichrist in all the Protean forms he may assume, is our *only* enemy!'

Savin, we presume, has come forward in the cause of Friend Dean; who, we think, he alludes to as the '*wounded brother*.' We submit to the candour of our readers to determine, whether from the complexion of his last communication, Friend Dean is best personated in the character of the *wounded*, or *wounding* brother! We think the *if* in this case, is far from being irrelevant. And that 'we should be as ready to do justice *ourselves*, as to exact it from others.' Whether Friend Dean has complied with the condition of our 'Prospectus,' and through the medium of *reason* attempted to draw *from*, or appeal *to* the *Scriptures* for truth, our readers will best determine. And the declaration in our 'Prospectus,' and 'even under exceptionable circumstances, personalities excepted,' &c., strong as it binds the Editor, would have been much stronger, had it declared, 'and even under the *most* exceptionable circumstances, with the *single* exception of *personalities*,' &c. Our correspondent will please to notice, that, the instancing *personalities*, (which are necessarily construed to mean an implication of an individual's moral character, from the marked distinction which exists between that as a *private* concern, and his sentiments which he has made *public*, and thereby set an example, which authorizes *others* to follow,) as *one* exception, by no means supposes there can be *no* other! Our 'Prospectus' declares to this effect—That no accommodation on the part of a correspondent, will be considered an equivalent for attacking the private reputation, name, or character, of *any* man. But, that there are *other* exceptionable circumstances, besides this, and therefore, under circumstances which *would* be exceptionable, the 'writer shall be gratified, &c., by publicly acknowledging them for *his* own;' otherwise, the Editor would have to acknowledge them for *his* own; for if *he* did not, the public would do it *for* him!

Savin will, likewise, please to notice, that our 'Prospectus' is couched in *very* strong terms, as follows—'*No* communication will ever be rejected by the Editor of this paper, *provided* it is couched *in* admissible terms.' Not, no *manuscript*, of any *name* or nature. The *admissible* terms are discovered by reading our Prospectus, of which the Punctilio is, not an *addition*, but an *explanation*. Manuscripts found in our 'letter-box,' addressed to '93 *Gold-Street, &c.,*' or to '*The public*,' or to '*J. C. and Impartialist*,' (as we recently *saw* one,) may be published *by* '93 Gold-Street'—or the 'Public'—or 'J. C. and Impartialist,' to whom they are addressed! But—communications addressed to the '*Editor of the Gospel Herald*'—or headed, '*For the Gospel Herald*,' will be attended to. And we hope Savin will excuse us, for *believing*, that 'attempts to evade this *address*,' are some of the 'Protean shapes'—which 'Antichrist' would 'assume' to upset the cause of truth, and *evade* the acknowledgement of Jesus Christ as the *only* Saviour.

Relative to the 'pouring the wine and oil of the salvation of God into the wounded hearts of our brethren,' &c., we remark—that in our opinion, it would be *poured* to little effect, if we *tamely* submitted to have the 'Gospel Herald,' (the instrument used in this 'pouring,') stigmatized with opprobrious epithets. We reiterate again, '*Truth* is the object—*reason* the means to obtain it—and the *Scriptures*, the source *alone* from which it is to be obtained!'

We conclude with the remark—that the *title* of this paper, call it a '*mote*, or a *beam*,' let him cast it out of his *eye* who will, if we ever cast it out of *our* eye, 'may our right hand forget her cunning!'

Note. When conscientious scruples clash with free toleration, who is to blame? Friend Dean may exercise ten millions of conscientious scruples; and in return, let the Editor exercise ONE! Friend Dean can at any time be gratified by the publication of *his* sentiments, on the easy condition of consenting to let the Editor publish *his*. And Friend Dean can have no more right to persist in *his* sentiments, than the Editor has to persist in *his!* And, although we are willing to be *servant* to all men, we are determined to be *slave* to *none !!!*

NEW BIBLES.

A correspondent in our last, over the signature of Gamma, requested information, whether the 'Bible is *now* to be superceded by Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress,' &c. To this we answer, if this book was as popular as Calvin's Institutes, or Hopkins's System of Doctrines, we think such an event would not be very improbable. The practice of some, who read a sentence, or a part of a sentence from the Bible, and then shut the Book, and once or twice during their harangue repeating their motto, is, we think, a poor compliment to be paid to that Book, which they pretend is the man of their counsel.

On the whole, however, we think this practice indicates a delicate sense of propriety in those who practise it. For it would seem they were aware of the impropriety of *apparently* recurring to the Scriptures for instruction and doctrine, when they are really producing their matter from another, and altogether different source.

'*Heaven taken by Storm.*'

A book entitled '*The Christian Soldier, or Heaven taken by storm, Showing the Holy Violence a Christian is to put forth in the pursuit after glory,*' &c. *was* published in 1816, in this city, from the '*Second London Edition.*' The writer having taken a *disjointed* passage, spun out his book to 195 pages, preferring, it appears, his own imagination to the text, or context, for matter, or proof for illustration, &c. The consistency of this writer might, in the opinion of some, be a fruitful subject for panegyric. But we think those who are in the habit of seeing things *as they are*, will wonder a little at this writer's declaration in the 14th page, 'Though heaven be *given* us *freely*, yet we must *contend* for it!' The following is a specimen of his application of the Scriptures—'Those beasts under the law which did not chew the cud, were unclean. Such as do not *chew the cud* by holy meditation, are to be reckoned among the unclean. The *earth* is inherited by the *meek*. Heaven is inherited by the *violent*. The right way to *take* heaven is by *storm*.'

Christ said, 'Blessed are the *poor in Spirit;* for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' Now we very much question whether to be '*poor* in spirit,' and to be '*violent*,' is the *same*. This writer, however, says, 'None get into heaven but *violent* ones!' The prophet says, 'Evil shall hunt the *violent* man to overthrow him!' Again, 'Him that loveth *violence* his soul hateth.' This writer, speaking of the man who would go to heaven says, he 'must offer *violence* four ways—To himself—to the world—to Satan—to heaven!' Of meditation ('or chewing the *cud*,') he says, 'Did people but meditate on the *damnableness* of sin; did they but think when they meddle with it there is a *rope* at the *end of* it which will *hang* them eternally in hell, they would break off a course of sinning and become *new* creatures.' Now, if this were the case, it is a great pity that these *violent* preachers cannot set people to *thinking!* It seems, if they would only *think* of the *rope*, &c., 'they would become *new* creatures.' Now it is our opinion that a man would have to exercise a great deal of *violence*, and *storm* heaven very hard, before he *scaled* the walls and gained an entrance this way! This writer is certainly *violent*, and in his declarations, we think a little deficient in proof. He says, 'our sabbath is *altered* by Christ's *own appointment*.' And, 'there is but a short space of time granted us, therefore *work* the harder for heaven before it be too *late*. A man's personal day of grace may be short.' He says, 'The day of *grace* being lost, the next is a *day of wrath*.' To prove this to mean endless misery, he quotes Luke xix. 42. We think it would have looked better, if he had quoted the 43d and 44th verses, with it; and Matt. xxiii. 39. We think it would be very difficult for any person to tell what things could belong to *their* peace, if they are never going to have *any* peace!

For *logical* distinction, the following may serve as a specimen, 'Yet this caution I must necessarily insert. Though we shall not obtain the kingdom *without* violence, yet not *for* our violence. When we have done all, look up to Christ and *free* grace. By *grace* are ye saved.' Here this writer stopped short. If he had added—'*Not* of works, lest any man should boast;' it would have detracted *too* much from his 'holy *violence!*'

This book concludes with a short sermon, which contains the following—'*True* faith is ever found in an heart *deeply humbled* for sin.' There is, in our opinion, a difference between a man's being 'deeply humbled for *sin*,' and being so violent as to *storm* all creation, and even erecting his battering rams against the walls of *heaven* itself! There is a reflection familiar to us, and we think it can do no man any harm to take it into consideration. It is this. That no man *can* be so deeply humbled with a sense of his *own* unworthiness as to confess, in honest sincerity, *himself* to be the *chief* of sinners, who believes God will damn any of the race of Adam for being *greater* sinners than *himself!* And that no man, who in sincerity believes 'God to be good to *all*, and his *tender mercies* over *all* his works,' *can* suppose that God will ever 'afflict or grieve any of the children of men' unnecessarily, or ever, but for their *own* individual, and final happiness!

From the Boston Universalist Magazine.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER ADDRESSED TO BELIEVERS IN ETERNAL MISERY.

But it may be thought proper that I should notice some of the passages of Scripture which are used to establish the doctrine which I have endeavoured to refute, and have said is not the doctrine of the Bible. The reader may perhaps say, is not the word everlasting applied to the duration of punishment? And is not the word eternal used for the same purpose? We answer, yes. These words are found in the following parts of the Bible: Jude 6, 7; Mark iii. 29; 2 Thes. i. 7—9; Dan. xii. 2; Matt. xviii. 8, 25, 41; Isaiah xxxiii. 14. Now we ask, will these passages contradict any other portion of the sacred testimony? No; then the inspired writers did not mean to convey the idea of punishment without end. In order to obviate the difficulty which appears to embarrass us, we will quote a few passages from the Scriptures in which these words are used so that they cannot mean endless duration. And if the sacred penman used the words from which these are translated to convey the duration of things which have long since come to an end, how do we know but that they always used them for the same meaning?—And again, when we find these words, if interpreted in this way, directly opposed to the manifest meaning of Scriptures which cannot be unmeaningly misunderstood, we must suppose there has been given to them a meaning contrary to that which was originally intended.—But says the objector, can you produce any Scriptures where terms are used so that they cannot imply endless duration? Yes, we can. See Ex. xl. 15, 'And thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office; for their anointing shall surely be an *everlasting* priesthood throughout their generation.' Levit. xvi. 34;

'And this shall be an *everlasting* statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel, for all their sins, once a year.' Now let us see what St. Paul says about the priesthood. 'If, therefore, perfection were by the *Levitical priesthood*, [for under it the people received the law] what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchisedeck, and not be called after the order of Aaron? *For the priesthood being changed*, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident; for that after the similitude of Melchisedeck there arises another priest, who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.'—Heb. vii. 11—17. What could be argued more strongly than the apostle here argues the abolition of the Levitical priesthood? Again, in Heb. iii. 6; 'The *everlasting* mountains were scattered, the *perpetual* hills did bow.' Can these words imply endless duration?

It is somewhat remarkable that St. Luke does not use the word *aionion*, or everlasting, in connexion with the misery of the wicked in his gospel. St. Mark uses it only once; and in the Gospel of St. John and all his epistles it is not to be found once in that connexion.—St. Paul does not mention everlasting destruction but once, though his writings form so considerable a part of the New Testament. Such words are not found in the epistles of St. James and St. Peter. They are found but three times in the Gospel of St. Matthew, and but twice in the Old Testament. But were these words used only once in the whole Bible, and must remain in full force according to the general acceptation of them, we would not attempt to refute the doctrine of eternal misery. But as we know that these words are used in connexion so that they cannot mean endless duration, we deem it our duty to show how little support people have for this doctrine, which is so repugnant to the benevolence of God, to the general tenor of the Scriptures, to the nature of the gospel dispensation, and to the design of the Saviour's mission.

The words for ever, and for ever and ever, are also used in connexion with the punishment of the wicked, but they are also used in connexion where they cannot imply endless duration. The reader is referred to the following passages:—Gen. xiii. 15; 2 Chron. x. 7; 2 Kings v. 27; Gen. lxiii. 9; Exodus xii. 14; xxi. 6; xxviii. 43; Levit. vi. 13; Numb. x. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 30.

As it appears very evident, Christian brethren, that this doctrine of eternal misery has been a means of preventing a more general reception of the Christian religion, let us study the Scriptures with an earnest desire to attain a correct knowledge of them, that we may govern our lives by the principles which they contain; that our worship may not be in vain, (for certainly we cannot benefit God by the worship we pay to him; it was designed for our own happiness; therefore, if we believe him to possess a character which keeps us in continual dread of him, the great end of our worship is lost, and we worship in vain,) and that we may not 'put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in our brother's way.' And as this doctrine has been a 'stumbling-block,' let us take it away. Isaiah says, 'Cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare the way, take up the stumbling-block out of the way of my people. For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy, I will dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones. For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirits should fail before me, and the souls which I have made.'—Isaiah lvii. 14—16. W.

ANALOGY.

It has been and now is contended, that aside from Scripture testimony, respecting the existence of sin and misery in a future state of existence, this fact is capable of being proved by analogical reasoning, as follows: God, notwithstanding his holiness and goodness, now permits his rational creatures, in this mortal state, to go on in sin, and brings upon them many and grievous sufferings as a just retribution; therefore, if we reason from analogy, we must admit that this may be the case in a future state.

In reply to this reasoning, we think that every candid person will be willing to accept an extension of this same kind of reasoning, which, should it issue in an absurdity, or in what every one disbelieves, will be acknowledged a refutation of the argument. We will say, then, that as it is so ordered in divine Providence, that many wicked men acquire great riches and extensive power in this world, so if we reason from analogy, we must admit that this may be the case in a future state. And as it is often the case, that the rich and powerful in this world oppress and persecute the righteous, so if we reason from analogy, we must admit that this may be the case in a future state. And as it is a fact, that the wicked in this world partake of many carnal enjoyments, and live in luxury, while the virtuous are often poor and outwardly wretched, so if we reason from analogy, we must admit that this may be the case in a future state. And furthermore, as it is frequently the case in this world, that the wicked are brought to repentance, and to reform their lives, so reasoning from analogy, we must admit that it may so happen in a future state. And also, as it sometimes happens in this world, that those whose lives have been pious and virtuous for many years, fall into sin, become most vile and wretched, so reasoning from analogy, we must admit that this may be the case in a future state.

Without extending this reasoning to any more particulars, the candid reader will at once perceive, that it has already embraced what no Christian of any denomination ever thought of believing or contending for. Then the fact is, we cannot prove even the possibility of the existence of sin and misery in a future state, by reasoning analogically, any more than we can prove the foregoing particulars, which all will reject as absurdities.

We will frankly state to our opposers, that if they will prove from plain declarations of Scripture, that sin and misery will exist in a future state, we will give up the subject, and acknowledge that we are informed and corrected. Or if it can be proved that man will have a mutable constitution in a future world, subject to vanity as in this, we shall at once abandon the system we are now upon, and seek to be consistent with what we find ourselves necessitated to acknowledge.

Ibid.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Sir—I beg leave to recommend to you a picture of Calvinism, stripped of the gaudy dress with which it is generally painted by our *orthodox* divines. I extract it from Fletcher's Checks, a work which ought to be in the hands of every person, who wishes to see *truth* and *common sense* triumph over *error* and *nonsense*. Yours' &c.

Gamma.

'I suppose you are still upon your travels. You come to the borders of a great empire, and the first thing that strikes you, is a man in an easy carriage, going with folded arms to take possession of an immense estate, freely given him by the king of the country. As he flies along, you just make out the motto of the royal chariot in which he dozes—'*Free Reward.*' Soon after, you meet *five* of the king's carts, containing twenty wretches loaded with irons; and the motto of every cart is 'Free Punishment.' You inquire into the meaning of this extraordinary procession, and the sheriff attending the execution, answers, 'Know, curious stranger, that our monarch is *absolute;* and to show that *sovereignty* is the prerogative of his imperial crown, and that he is *no respecter of persons*, he distributes every day, *free rewards* and *free punishments*, to a certain number of his subjects.' 'What! without any regard to merit or demerit—by mere caprice?' Not altogether so, for *he pitches upon the worst of men*, and *chief of sinners*, and *upon such to choose*, for the subjects of his rewards, (*see Elisha Coles on the 'Sovereignty of God,'* p. 62.) And that his punishments may do as much honour to *free* sovereign *wrath*, as his bounty does to *free* sovereign *grace*, he pitches upon those that shall be executed *before they are born.* 'What! have these poor creatures in chains done no harm?' 'O yes,' says the sheriff, 'the king contrived that their parents should let them fall, and break their legs, before they had any knowledge; when they came to years of discretion, he commanded them to run a race with broken legs, and because they *cannot* do it, I am going to see them quartered. Some of them, besides this, have been obliged to fulfil the king's *secret will*, and *bring about his purposes;* and they shall be burned in yonder deep valley, called Tophet, for their trouble.' You are shocked at the sheriff's account, and begin to expostulate with him about the *freeness* of the *wrath* which burns a man for doing the king's will; but all the answer you can get from him is, 'Such an one is indeed accomplishing the king's [God's] decree; but he carries a dreadful mark in his forehead, that such a decree is, that 'he shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord' of the country. You cry out, 'God deliver me from the hands of a monarch, who *punishes with everlasting destruction* such as accomplish his decree!' and while the magistrate intimates, that your exclamation is a *dreadful mark*, if not upon your *forehead*, at least upon your *tongue;* that you yourself shall be apprehended against the next execution, and made a public instance of the king's free wrath, your blood runs cold; you bid the postilion turn the horses; they gallop for your life; and the moment you get out of the dreary land, you bless God for your escape.'

For the Gospel Herald.

The Apostle Peter says, 'The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.' I heard a Calvinistic minister quote this text lately, and in attempting to explain it, said, that the expression must be qualified; for, if the Almighty absolutely *willed* the salvation of all the human family, they would infallibly be saved; but that it is evident they neither are nor will be *all* saved, therefore, God *cannot will* it. Now what is this, but giving the *lie* direct to an inspired apostle? and yet this man receives an enormous salary for preaching *doctrines of grace*, as they are unhappily called.

Gamma.

Anecdote from Southey's Life of Wesley.

One magistrate in the county of Middlesex licensed fourteen hundred preachers in the course of five years. Of thirty-six persons who obtained licenses at one sessions, six spelled *ministers of the gospel* in six different ways, and seven signed their mark! One fellow, who applied for a license, being asked if he could read, replied, 'Mother reads, and I 'spounds and 'splains.'

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In our 43d Number we acknowledged the receipt of Reprehensor. We have since read the communication, and inform Reprehensor, that if he wishes his communication to be published, it is necessary for him to call or send at the office for it, and make some alteration in the phraseology. In his first communication we took the liberty to *erase* a sentence. A repetition of this might be thought an arbitrary assumption, &c. If Reprehensor wishes his communication to be published in its present shape, by affixing his name to it he can be gratified. It is with regret we remark, that a number of our correspondents have recently manifested a disposition to *abuse* the liberality of the Prospectus of this paper. We request our friends to maintain their freedom; but 'not to use their liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God.'

C. S. W. of New-Haven, requesting an exposition of Acts xiii. 48. is received.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 3, 1821. NO. 46.

Controversial.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SALVATION.

[*Concluded.*]

I have shown above that salvation is not from the *punishment* of sin, but from *sin itself*, how or in whatever manner effected. It remains for me to show who are the subjects of it. And these, I contend, are they who *believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ and *keep* his commandments. This I prove from Scripture. By *believing* on the Lord Jesus Christ, I understand faith in him as the manifested God and Saviour. And by keeping his commandments, a life in obedience to the Divine commandments.

When Christ healed the centurion's servant, (Matt. viii.5. and following verses) he said unto him, 'Go thy way, and as thou hast *believed* be it done unto thee.' Here, though the centurion's servant was healed of a *natural* disorder, yet it was the centurion himself, whose faith in the Lord and Saviour had rendered him an object of praise and admiration to his heavenly Father; for he says, on the centurion's humble request of him, that he would come and heal his servant, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.' But what was this faith? A faith in Jesus as the manifested God of heaven and earth. For when he answered him that he would come and heal his servant, the centurion replies that he was not worthy that he should come under his roof, but says he, '*speak the word* only, and my servant shall be healed.'

Jesus said unto the woman whom he healed of the issue of blood, (Matt. ix. 22.) 'thy faith hath made thee whole.' That this also was a faith in Jesus as the only God of heaven and earth, is plain from what is said of the woman in the preceding verse, 'for she said within herself, If I may but touch the hem of his garment, I shall be whole,' for from whom but the Omnipotent God can such virtue proceed, even from the hem of his garment? So when he restored the two blind, men to sight, as related in the same chap. from 28th to 30th verse, when he came into the house, he said unto them; 'Believe ye that *I am able* to do this? They said unto him, Yea, Lord. Then touched he their eyes, saying, According to your *faith* be it unto you.'

The above are adduced out of a multitude of other proofs of the same kind, merely to show that it was *faith* in Jesus, as the *Omnipotent God* of heaven and earth, by which in the days of his flesh he healed the natural disorders of men, which all represented and signified the healing of spiritual disorders or deliverance from sin. And that it is by the same faith, that he heals our spiritual disorders, is plain from this, 'And they brought unto him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed; and Jesus seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer, thy *sins* be forgiven thee.' (Matt. ix. 2.) Why did our Lord on this occasion say unto the sick of the palsy 'thy *sins* be forgiven thee,' when it was obvious that the man came to be healed of his *natural* disorder, unless there was some connexion between that and the forgiveness of sins? This the Scribes did not comprehend, and therefore, they said, 'this man blasphemeth.' But Jesus knowing their thoughts said, 'Wherefore think you evil in your hearts? For whether is it easier to say, thy *sins* be forgiven thee, or to say, *arise* and *walk*. But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy) arise, take up thy bed, and go into thine own house. And he arose and departed to his house.' Let me ask again, how was this a proof that the Son of man had power on earth to forgive sins? Does not the Lord here plainly teach the carnal Jews, that it was by *faith* in him as the Omnipotent God of heaven and earth, that salvation was to be obtained? For to convince them that he had power to *forgive sins*, he says to the sick of the palsy, 'take up thy bed and walk.' And to show them by healing their natural disorders was represented and signified the healing of their spiritual disorders, or the saving them from their sins, he said to the sick of the palsy, when he was brought to be healed of that infirmity, 'thy *sins* be forgiven thee.'

But there are direct proofs in abundance to the same effect. I will advance one or two of them. 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever *believeth* in him, should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* in him, should not perish but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He that *believeth* on him is not condemned; but he that *believeth not* is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.' (John iii. 14—18.)

Here faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is declared to be essential to the possession of everlasting life. Again, in the 36th verse of the same chap. it is said, 'He that *believeth* on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that *believeth not* the Son shall not see life.'

The greatest, as is supposed, of human authority has said, 'By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.' Here again, *faith* is made the essential of salvation. (It is immaterial which way we understand this passage, whether *salvation*, or *faith*, or *grace*, be the gift of God, it is still through *faith*, that we are saved; and *to believe* is as much an *act* on the part of the believer, as *to do*. The one is an act of the understanding, the other of the will. Therefore plainly a condition.) To multiply passages is needless. The above I hope are sufficient. At any rate they ought to be.

Let us now see whether a *life according to the commandments*, be not equally necessary with *faith* to entitle us to salvation. 'Blessed are they that *do* his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.' Rev. xxii. 14. 'Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God; and whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, *because* we *keep* his commandments, and *do* those things that are pleasing in his sight. 1 John iii. 21. 'And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of Life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their *works*. Rev. xx. 12. 'And they were judged every man according to his *works*.' 13th verse.

Our Lord, in conclusion of his memorable sermon on the mount, says, 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth* the will of my Father which is in heaven.' Matt. vii. 22. 'Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and *doeth* them, I will liken unto a wise man,' &c. 24th verse. 'And every one that heareth these sayings of mine and *doeth them not*, shall be likened unto a foolish man,' &c. 26th verse.

If these passages, and a multitude of others of the same import, do not inculcate the doctrine that *obedience* to the Divine command, or a *good life*, are essential to salvation, I must confess I am at a loss to understand their meaning. What was the end and object of our Lord's instructions? Was it not to lead men in the way to happiness? And what was this way? Was it not holiness? And can man be holy without being good? 'Except a man be born again, says Christ, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' To be born again, must have relation to *ourselves*, and can we be born again without some change wrought in our hearts and lives, represented and signified by these words?

It will perhaps be objected, that an apostle hath said, 'By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.' But another apostle (James) has said, 'By *works* a man is justified, and not by *faith* only!' To draw from single passages of this kind, the fundamental doctrines of our faith, without regard to the particular occasion on which they were written, or without considering them in reference to the main design and end of the writer, is, to say the least of it, a very unsafe mode of reasoning. This I conceive to be the fruitful source of all the errors of Universalism. And if some competent hand would collect together, and point out the true force and meaning of these insulated texts, he would do Christianity a service. I do not mean that Universalists alone have deceived themselves, by this mode of proceeding; others have done the same. That monstrous tenet of salvation by faith alone, as held by the Calvinists, has had its origin from a single passage of the apostle, totally misunderstood, and altogether wrongfully applied.

'By *grace* are ye saved.' True. But then it is by grace '*through faith*.' Faith, therefore, is essential to salvation. But by *faith* again, is not meant simply, *belief;* because faith is *two-fold;* in the *understanding*, and also in the *will*. Faith in the *understanding only*, is that species of faith which is possessed by those of whom our Lord speaks above, that they hear his words, but *do* them not; whereas faith in the *understanding* and in the *will*, is that species of faith which is professed by those, who hear his sayings and *do* them. And this is the faith which the apostle means, when he says, 'By grace are ye saved through *faith*.' That it is of grace it cannot be denied. And what is there, I would ask, which we possess, that is not? It is of God that we *live*, *move*, and have our *being*. They are all the gift of God.

J. C.

REMARKS.

Of J. C.'s *eighth* paragraph, relative to those who are the subjects of salvation, and in answer to his definition of faith, 'Believing on the Lord Jesus Christ as the manifested God and Saviour,' &c., we observe, that our believing that Christ is *our* Saviour will not make him our Saviour; and except he *was* our Saviour *before* we believed it, we are called upon to believe a *lie*. And it is impossible for Jesus Christ to *be* our Saviour, except he actually *saves* us; agreeably to the declaration, 'He shall be called Jesus, (Saviour) for he *shall* save his people from their sins.' Not be called (Saviour) Jesus, because he shall make it possible for them to comply with *conditions* and *be* saved! The Scriptures declare that Jesus is the Saviour; and John said, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world.' Now if the sins of the world will *never* be taken away by Christ, the Lamb of God, it then follows inevitably, that John was mistaken. And if the Lamb of God *does* take away the sins of the world, (*kosmou*, all men,) it then follows, of necessity, that the sufferings of the world, the consequence *of* sin, will cease. Reader, if John told the truth, and J. C. is correct in his definition of the word *salvation*, (and we think he is) where is the obstacle in the way to the happiness *of* the world?

J. C. in his *ninth* paragraph, introduces Matt. viii. 5, &c., to prove the instrumentality of *faith* in salvation. Now, we are quite willing to acknowledge, that no man ever did, or ever will experience

the joys of salvation without faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

In his *tenth* paragraph, J. C. introduces a number of quotations from the Scriptures, to prove that faith is *necessary* to salvation. This we grant; but let it be remembered, that for a thing to be *necessary*, and to be a *condition*, are *two* things. It is *necessary* that a man should *eat* food, to live; and he cannot live without; but life is not *conditional* on eating; if it were, a man would live as *long* as he did *eat!* And it is remarkable, that this necessity exists independent of the man, who cannot procure what is *necessary* for himself, but it is given him by his heavenly Father. If life was conditional on eating, the man could furnish himself with his food, independent of any other being; for it is absurd, to the last degree, to suppose a condition imposed by a superior Being, upon an inferior, and the terms of that condition require the exercise of a *superior* power to comply with them!

J. C. in his *eleventh* paragraph proceeds, and introducing the 'lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness,' &c., quotes as follows—'Even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever *believeth* on him should not *perish*, but have eternal life. For God so loved the *world*, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to *condemn* the world, but that the *world through him might be saved*. He that *believeth* on him is not condemned, but he that *believeth not* is condemned already, because he hath not *believed* in the name of the only begotten Son of God. John iii. Now we are free to acknowledge that unbelievers *perish*. And that all unbelievers are under condemnation. And we urge the consideration of the reason assigned for their condemnation and perishing, which is, because they do not *believe* in the *name* of the only begotten Son of God. What is the name? Ans. Jesus, Saviour! Those who do not believe in his name, are condemned. Here is cause and consequence. 'There is no other name given under heaven among men, whereby we *must* be saved, but the name of Jesus.' Consequently, there can be *no* salvation to any but those who believe in *his* name; and so long as men remain in unbelief of the salvation of God, so long they are under condemnation, and in a perishing condition. But we are instructed, that God *loved the world*—that he sent his Son to *save* the world, not to condemn the world! Will God *change*? Will he at any future time *cease* to love the world? Will he be disappointed, and the object for which Christ came, never be obtained? No! It is worthy of remark, that it is not declared that Christ came to tell the world of mankind that they must save *themselves*—Christ came to *save* the world—there is no salvation but through him—Consequently, all who deny, and disbelieve this *truth*, from necessity remain in a state of condemnation. They are condemned already! Their own declarations relative to what they must in the *future* do to *be* saved, prove that in their opinion the work is not done; and in their opinion, what Christ came to effect he was not able to accomplish; and they proclaim their own condemnation; deny the only Saviour; 'forsake the fountain of living waters, and hew out to themselves cisterns, *broken* cisterns which can hold *no* water.'

J. C. in his *twelfth* paragraph, says, 'Here faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, is declared to be *essential* to the possession of everlasting life.' This we perfectly agree with. But we again remark—there is a difference between faith being *essential*, or necessary, and being a *condition*. And we have no hesitation in saying, this is a position which can never be controverted. J. C. continues—"Again, in the 36th verse of the same chap. it is said, 'He that *believeth* on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that *believeth not* the Son, shall not see life." Here we agree again perfectly. Here is cause and consequence. And we believe there never *was*, nor ever *will* be an unbeliever who ever did, or ever will see life! But you will please to notice, that when a man *believes*, he is an unbeliever no longer.

J. C. in his *thirteenth* paragraph, quotes Paul's declaration, 'By *grace* are ye saved through faith, and that *not* of yourselves,' &c., and remarks, 'It is immaterial which way we understand this passage; whether *salvation*—*faith*—or *grace*—be the gift of God, it is still through *faith* that we are saved; and to *believe*, is as much an act on the part of the believer, as *to do*. The one is the act of the *understanding*, the other of the *will*. Therefore, plainly a *condition*.' Supposing a man should offer J. C. $10,000, on the condition of believing that New-York was the city of London, and that the late trial of the Queen was held in the *City Hall*, &c., here would be a *condition*, and all J. C. would have *to do* would only be to *believe* it, and then, he would receive $10,000.—'And to *believe* is as much an act of the *understanding*, as *to do* (any thing) is an act of the will.'—Could he comply with the *condition*? We think not. But we think, according to St. Paul's declaration, the case is a little different. Paul says, that '*faith* is the *gift of* God.' And to put the matter at rest, declares, it is '*not* of *yourselves*—not of *works!*' We ask J. C. of his *condition*, whether that is *of* the *man;* and whether it is a *work?* If J. C. answers in the affirmative, then, we say, it is not the *essential* thing Paul speaks of; because Paul declares it is *not* of yourselves! If J. C. answers in the negative, then we say, no man can be made miserable for not doing that which he *cannot* do! And further, it is no condition at all. J. C. appears to ground his argument upon the necessity of the case. If it is essential, then the essential thing *must* be a *conditional* thing. The motion of the *lungs* is very *essential* to life. Is respiration, therefore, *conditional?* In God we live, move, and have our being, and in him are all our ways. Now this is essential; it is even indispensable, (though not more so than *faith*,) but, is it *conditional?* Let a stone be dropped from any height within our atmosphere, and that principle in nature called gravitation is *essential* and indispensable to its *falling* to the earth; Is it *conditional* with the stone to *fall*, fly off, or remain stationary? Now the principle, or power of gravity, is the *gift of God*, as much, and no more, nor less, than *faith* is the gift of God. And the falling of the stone is just as much of itself, as faith is of ourselves. And the stone can boast of its falling, with as much reason, as man can boast of his faith. We believe *this* can never be controverted. With a view to prevent the possibility of misconstruction, we remark—that so far from attempting to lessen the force of J. C.'s reasoning, relative to faith being *essential* to salvation, we would rather increase it; for if there can be no salvation without *faith*, it is incontestably true, that faith being the medium *through* which we are saved, and it being true, likewise, that we are saved *through* Christ, it follows of consequence, that if Jesus, the Saviour, does not *give* the *faith*, that he leaves the work imperfect; and a very *essential* part of salvation, without which all else is good for nothing, is omitted, and man not being saved, Jesus Christ, of necessity, is not the Saviour! Here is the conclusion, and those who do not like it, can dispose of it only by giving up the premisses on which it is founded—there is no other remedy!

J. C. in his *fourteenth* paragraph, quotes a number of passages; and observes, 'Let us now see whether a life according to the commandments, be not *equally* necessary with *faith*, to entitle us to salvation.' Now we contend, that *faith* will produce *works*, which will always be in proportion to the *faith*. We believe this is as certain, as it is certain that heat and cold, will expand and contract the mercury in the thermometer; and that a man's works are as effectually influenced by his faith, as the mercury is acted upon by the changes *in* the atmosphere. Whether this comparison (which we think a just one,) will redound to the honour of our pious folks, is another consideration. It is therefore evident, that faith and works, are *cause* and *effect*. Faith will produce *works*, but works will not produce *faith!* Now it being an incontrovertible fact, that an effect cannot *exist* without having a cause, it follows, that the *effect* must be *less* than the cause; the cause having the precedence in priority of time, and has therefore, the pre-eminence; the *effect* being produced, owes its every existence to the *cause*. God is the *giver* of the *cause*, which is *faith*, and man is therefore emphatically indebted to him for every good and perfect gift. J. C. has settled the question, that all shall be saved who *believe* in the Lord Jesus Christ; and we presume he would not deny, but that a man may lead a sinful life for *seventy* years, and *one* hour before he *dies*, receive from God, *faith* in the Lord Jesus Christ. The man, therefore, *must* be saved. But, if all are damned whose *lives* are not in conformity with this faith, which this man received only *one* hour before his death, he must be damned likewise; and his *faith*, so far from availing him any thing, would in the end prove to be *no faith* at all; for he *believed* that Christ was his *Saviour*, and instead of Christ's *saving* him, he *damns* him for ever! It is really astonishing, that men, whose decisions on questions relative to their money concerns, and to the variety of subjects on which they are called to act, and decide, are so prompt and correct, should, in this, of all concerns the most weighty, introduce a species of reasoning, and draw conclusions, which, in their worldly concerns, would ruin their reputations for prudence and sagacity, to say the least, if it did not make them inmates of a lunatic hospital. Now, we ask, What is the commandment of God? Ans. *Believe—believe!* Believe what? 'Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou *shalt* be saved.' Can a man be saved, that is, experience the joys of salvation, without *believing*, without *faith?* Never! As well might a man whose senses were steeped in the most profound *sleep*, experience, and his mind be acted upon by the transaction which happened during his sleep. Mankind are *sleeping*—their senses as steeped in the most profound and stupifying drowsiness of the traditions of men—of error! They neither see nor hear the things which belong to their eternal peace; for they are hidden from their eyes. The *blind* are leaders of the *blind*, and millions have fallen into the ditches, dug by Calvin, Arminius, Hopkins, and others; who, in the true spirit of contradiction, seek refuge in a *faith* they cannot *define*, and when closely pursued, retreat to *works* they never can *practise!* We regret that J. C. in quoting 1 John iii. 21. had not added the next verse, which appears to be necessary to understand the passage—'And *this* is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment.' Here are *faith* and *works*. And we fear the *faith* of those cannot be of the right kind, whose *works* consist in consigning their brethren to endless misery. This is certainly as great an evil, and savours as much of *hatred*, as any thing an *enemy* could do! J. C. quotes Rev. xx. 12. Of this we remark—The day of judgment, is the gospel day—which continues until Christ in his Mediatorial kingdom subdues all things unto himself. Christ sits on the throne, a King—when he came, the *earth* and the *heaven* (the Jewish earth, dominion; and the Jewish heaven, their church,) fled away, &c. The *dead* are mankind, dead in trespasses and sins—the *books* are now open—the books of *nature*, of the *law*, and of the *gospel*, or life—they who attempt to justify themselves by the book of *nature*, or the book of *Moses*, the *law*, are now judged out of those books, to which they look for justification, and not being justified, their own consciences condemning them, they are, in apprehension, cast into the lake of fire, figurative of the sufferings which proceed from uncertainty relative to a future state. For it is according to their works, that they are judged. Consider this language highly *figurative*, and the difficulty vanishes. The *sea* is the Gentiles. And who are in '*death* and *hell*?' Ans. All unbelievers! It is remarkable, that 'death and hell give up their dead,' and 'death and hell are cast into the lake of fire, this (emphatically) is the second death.' Let it be noticed, that those who are not found written in the book of life, (the gospel, do not *believe*, &c.) are cast, *not* into hell, (darkness, unbelief, for they *were* there *before*,) but 'into the lake of fire.' It is likewise remarkable, that the Jews are not included here. The Jewish church and dominion fled away at the coming of Christ, and there was found no place for them. On this passage, we at present make only one remark more—If any person supposes this brief view incorrect, and that the things here mentioned take place in a *future* state, *after* the general resurrection, at the final

consummation of all things, we say, PROVE IT!

J. C. introduces his *fifteenth* paragraph, by quoting Matt. vii. 22. We have only room to remark—that very many are now saying 'Lord, Lord,' and the reason they do not enter the kingdom of heaven is, because they do not do the will of the Father, which is, 'that all men shall be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth.' When they do his will, and love *all*, and are willing that *all* shall be saved, and believe it, they will *enter*, and not *before!* And those who do his will, and believe *all will be saved*, build their house upon a *rock*, and the flood of Calvinists, or rain of Hopkinsians, and Arminians, will never destroy it. But the foolish man, who heareth the sayings, but doeth them not, does not believe them, his house, or *peace*, is overthrown by every wind of doctrine.

J. C. in his *sixteenth* paragraph, considers, &c., that '*obedience* is *essential* to salvation,' &c. Granted. It is essential; but it is not a condition. It is impossible for a man to sin, and be happy. J. C. finally sums up all in the *new birth*. He that is 'born again,' will certainly be saved. This, none will dispute. We ask, Is the 'new birth' a *cause*, or *effect*? None, we think, will dispute that it is the *effect* of a *cause*. Is *faith* the *cause*? If so, a man must have faith *before* he is born again; for an effect must be *posterior* to the cause! *Works*, we presume, no man will say *can* be the *cause*—in fine, we think the very idea of this 'new birth' being the work of *man*, is absurd. For the man is not the *actor*, but is acted *upon*. The figure is natural. Who will presume to say, that he procured his own birth? Christ has settled this question. He that is 'born again,' is born of the Spirit; and as we hear the sound of the wind, but cannot tell from whence it cometh, nor whither it *goeth*, so is every one that is born of the *Spirit*. Now we shall contend, that any birth which man has a hand in, and which is produced by his *works*, or *faith*, is *not* of the Spirit!

J. C. commences his *seventeenth* paragraph as follows—"It will perhaps be objected, that an apostle hath said, 'By *grace* are ye saved, through faith, and that not of *yourselves*, it is the *gift* of God.' But another apostle (James) has said, 'By *works* a man is justified, and not by *faith* only.' Now we tell J. C. that this is evasion; not argument. And although J. C. considers that the 'fruitful source of the *errors* of Universalists,' is the misconstruction of '*single* passages,' we tell him plainly, that he cannot produce so much as a *single* passage, which declares that any man is justified to the saving of his soul, by his *works*, or his *faith*, or by *both* together! What is the fruitful source of J. C.'s errors? Not *single* passages; for he cannot *find* them! Let James speak for himself—'Of his *own* will begat he us by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of *first* fruits unto God of his creatures.' Where now, is the *single* passage? Does not James testify to the same as Paul? Hear him—'Do not *err*, my beloved brethren, every *good* gift, and every *perfect* gift, is from (where? From *our* faith and works? No!) above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.' Paul likewise says, 'We have believed in Jesus Christ; that we might be *justified* by the faith *of* Christ, and *not* by the *works* of the law.' Gal. ii. 16. Now we say with James, that '*faith* without *works* is dead.' Nay, more—It is impossible for *faith* to exist, without producing *works!* And for a man to attempt to *show*, or prove that his faith is right, by exhibiting his faith as evidence that his *works* are good, is as great an absurdity, as to produce a disjointed heap of machinery, which had never been put together, or in motion, to prove, or show what its effects *would* be. Read the whole of James's Epistle, and the subject is explained. And we ask, How did Rahab's work justify her? Ans. She had *faith* to believe the Israelites would capture the city and spare her life; and her works *justified* her faith; for she made no attempt to save herself, or family, but relied implicitly upon the promises of kind treatment made to her by the spies whom she received, &c. This is the last passage which an Arminian should quote. For had Rahab been tinctured with modern theology, she would have distrusted the *promises* made her, and attempted to save herself by flight, before the city was attacked. Now we contend, that if there are any whose *works justify their faith*, or who are justified in any sense by their works, it is the believer in the Universal, and Unconditional Salvation of God for a lost world. For like Rahab, he *believes* the promises that are made him, and rests in peace and safety, until his heavenly Father takes him to happiness and heaven!

Of Paul's declaration J. C. observes—'By grace are ye saved.'—True. But then it is by grace *through faith*. Faith, therefore, is essential to salvation,' &c. Now, we ask the question—*How* are we saved? Ans. 'By *grace*.' What is *grace*? It is *favour*. What is *favour*? It is that disposition of the Divine mind, which regards with mercy, pity, compassion and *love*, lost man. It is therefore the favour, or *grace*, or love of God, which is the *cause* of man's salvation. It naturally occurs to the mind, supposing man is never *made* acquainted *with*, or arrives *at*, the knowledge *of* this love, favour, or *grace* of God, toward him, of what use or value can it be to him, any more than natural enjoyments are to the *brute* creation? We answer;—None at all! Can man, of *himself*, arrive at this knowledge, without which he never can be happy? No! Never! Will the favour, *grace*, or love of God do things by *halves*, and let man for ever continue in a perishing condition, when there is enough, and to spare, and condemn him to this misery, for being deficient in that *knowledge* which he can never acquire? Reason, nature, and revelation, cry out against this supposition, as blasphemous—as an unwarrantable impeachment of the purposes of the God of the whole earth. God has declared by his prophet, 'My people perish for lack of *knowledge*.' Not for *lack* of favour, *grace*, or love in God. This knowledge is the faith, the *essential* thing which J. C. contends for—it is *through* this knowledge, or faith, that man arrives at the salvation of God. This is the *medium*—this is the source, and there is no other! How shall man obtain it? Is it for *sale*? What is the amount of the purchase-money; and who are the venders of this indispensable requisite? Ans. 'I am God; and beside me there is no Saviour. Look unto *Me*, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God, and besides me there is none else;' is the language of Omnipotence. And we declare none ever looked in vain. And the time is coming, when '*all* shall know him from the least unto the greatest. Thus saith God the *Lord*, he that created the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein; I have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant *of* the *people*, for a *light* of the *Gentiles*;—to open the *blind* eyes;—to bring *out* the *prisoners* from the prison;—them that *sit in darkness* out of the prison house. And I *will* bring the *blind* by a way (Christ,) they *knew not*; I *will lead* them in paths they have not *known*;—I *will* make darkness *light* before them, and crooked things straight. These things *will I do* unto them, and *not forsake them!* They *shall* be turned back;—they *shall* be greatly ashamed, that trust in graven images, that say to the molten images, Ye *are* our gods. Hear, ye *deaf*;—and look, ye *blind*, that ye *may* see. And in that day *shall* the deaf *hear* the words of the book;—and the eyes of the *blind shall see* out of obscurity, and out of darkness. They also that *erred* in spirit shall come to *understanding*, and they that murmured shall learn doctrine.' Isaiah xxix. xlii. How appropriate, therefore, are the concluding words of J. C.; and how unanswerable their import, by those who contend for *conditional* Salvation? 'That it is *of* grace, it *cannot* be denied. And what is there, I would ask, which we possess, that is not? It is of God that we *live*, *move*, and have our *being*. They are all of God!' True, J. C. and we entreat you no longer to contend that salvation is of *man*, and by so doing, deny the positive testimony of the Scriptures, and 'count the blood of the covenant, wherewith you are sanctified, an *unholy thing*.' Remember, that we are 'saved by *grace*, through *faith*, and that *not of ourselves*, (for) it is the *gift* of God. Not of *works*, lest any man should boast.'

'Now, unto *him* who is *able* to keep *us* from falling, and to *present us faultless* before the throne of his glory, with exceeding joy—Be honour and glory, dominion and power, for ever. Amen.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR—In your last you inserted a picture of Calvinism, as drawn by an Arminian, Mr. Fletcher; I now beg leave to present you with descriptions of Arminianism by Calvinists, which, if you think proper, I should like to see published in the Gospel Herald.

GAMMA.

'Scarce had our first parents made their appearance, when Satan, the *first Arminian*, began to preach the pernicious doctrine of free will to them; which so pleased the old gentlemen and his lady, that they (like thousands of their foolish offspring in this our day) adhered to the deceitful news, embraced it cordially, disobeyed the command of their Maker; and by so doing, launched their whole posterity into a cloud of miseries and ills. But some, perhaps, will be ready to say, that Arminianism, though an error, cannot be the root of other errors; to which I answer, that if it first originated in Satan, then I ask, from whence springs any error or evil in the world? Surely Satan must be the first moving cause of all evils that ever did, do now, or ever will make their appearance in this world; consequently, he was the first propagator of the accursed doctrine above mentioned. Hence Arminianism begat Popery, and Popery begat Methodism, and Methodism begat *moderate Calvinism*, and moderate Calvinism begat Baxterianism, and Baxterianism begat Unitarianism, and Unitarianism begat Arianism, and Arianism begat Universalism, and Universalism begat Deism, and Deism begat Atheism; and living and dying in the embracement of the above *evils*, or *isms*, where Christ is, they never can come. Thus I consider that Arminianism is the original of all the pernicious doctrines that are propagated in the world, and *Destructionism* will close the whole of them.' *Gospel Magazine for* 1807, *p.* 16. This was written by the Rev. Augustus M. Toplady.

'Of the two, (says Huntington the S. S.*) I would rather be a Deist than an Arminian; for an established Deist sears his own conscience, so that he goes to hell in the easy chair of insensibility; but the Arminian, who wages war with open eyes against the sovereignty of God, fights most of his battles in the very fears and horrors of hell.

Huntington's Works, vol. I. p. 363.

Mr. Toplady insists, that 'Socinus and Arminius are the two necessary supporters of a free-willer's coat of arms; for Arminianism is the *head*, and Socinianism is the *tail*, of one and the self-same serpent; and, when the head works itself in, it will soon draw the tail after it.' A tract of Mr. Wesley's, in which the fatal doctrine of Necessity is controverted and exposed, he calls, 'the famous Moorfields powder, and whose chief ingredients are an equal portion of gross Heathenism, Pelagianism, Mahometanism, Popery, Mancheism, Ranterism, and Antinomianism, culled, dried, pulverized, and mingled with as much palpable Atheism as you can scrape together.' 'I very much question, (says he) whether an Arminian can go to heaven;' of course he must have supposed that Mr. Wesley, as the Arch-Arminian of the age, bore about him the dreadful stamp of Reprobation.

The Calvinists represented Wesley to be 'as weak as he was vicious; he was like a monkey, an eel, or a squirrel, perpetually twisting and twining all manner of ways.' 'And for his doctrine, it was the most God-dishonouring and soul-distressing doctrine of the day; it was one of the prominent features of the *beast*; it was the enemy of God, and the offspring of the wicked one; the insolent brat of hell. Arminianism was the spiritual pestilence which had given the Protestant churches the plague: like a mortal scorpion, it carries a sting

* Sinner Saved.

in its tail, that affects with stupefaction, insensibility and death, all whom it strikes.'

On the other hand Fletcher says in his Checks, in answer to Richard Hill, Esq. author of *Pietas Oxoniensis*, and a rigid Calvinist, 'You decry illustrations, and I do not wonder at it; for they carry light into your Babel, where it is not desired. The father of errors begets *Darkness* and *Confusion*. From Darkness and Confusion springs *Calvinism*, who, wrapping himself up in some garments which he has stolen from the Truth, deceives the nations, and gets himself reverenced in a dark temple, as if he were the pure and free gospel. To bring him to a *shameful* end, we need not stab him with the dagger of *calumny*, or put him upon the rack of *persecution*. Let him only be dragged out of his obscurity, and brought unmasked to the open light, and the silent beams of truth will pierce him through! Light alone will torture him to death, as the meridian sun does a bird of night, that cannot fly from the gentle operation of its beams.'

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR—The enclosed Appeal, was handed to me by a Unitarian, and as it is too obscure for my comprehension, should be happy to hear your comments upon it.

Respectfully Your's,
A. C.

UNITARIANS' APPEAL.

The doctrines of Unitarianism having recently been made the object of the most unfounded obloquy and misrepresentation, it is thought proper to offer our Christian Brethren a plain and explicit statement of our religious opinions.

We believe that the New Testament contains a faithful record of all-important Revelation which God made to mankind by Jesus Christ.—We believe in the divinity of our Lord's doctrines and mission. We believe him to be "the Christ, the Son of the Living God."

We believe that JEHOVAH, the GOD AND FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the ONLY TRUE GOD, because our Saviour expressly declared it. We believe that HE is the ONLY PROPER OBJECT OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP, because our Saviour expressly declared this also, and, by precept and by example, taught his disciples to pray to the FATHER, and to HIM ALONE. We believe that the FATHER is the original Source of every blessing, and that HIS FREE UNMERITED GRACE is the SOLE ORIGINAL SPRING of the Salvation which is by Christ, because such is the express and uniform language of the New Testament.—*John* xvii. 3; *Matt.* iv. 10; vi. 9; xxvi. 39; *John* iv. 23, 24; xvi. 23; *Eph.* i. 3; *Tit.* iii. 4—7. See also *Deut.* iv. 35; vi 4; xxxii. 39; *Isa.* xlv. 5, 21, 22; lii. 13; *Mark* xii. 29—32; *Rom.* xvi. 27; 1 *Cor.* viii. 4—6; 1 *Tim.* ii. 5; *Phil.* iv. 6, 7; *Exod.* xxxiv. 14.

These fundamental principles appear to us distinctly, plainly, and expressly taught in various parts of the Scriptures; and we see no proof whatever, that these teach any thing inconsistent with them. It is indeed impossible that revealed truth can be inconsistent with itself; and we hold that *whatever* (through the imperfection of human language) *is obscure, or of doubtful meaning, ought*, in reason and common sense, *to be interpreted by the clear and express declarations of the Scriptures in other parts.*

In the foregoing principles all Unitarians agree; on other points we differ as to the teachings of the Scriptures. Some, for instance, hold that our Saviour existed before his human birth in a state of great glory and happiness; others, that he was, as to nature, 'in all respects like his brethren.' But as he ascribes all his powers, and refers all his authority, to the Father who sent him,—as he expressly says, 'My Father is greater than I,' and declares that he did not himself know the time when his prophecy respecting Jerusalem would be fulfilled, we all believe in his subordination to the Father, and dependence upon Him; we all believe in the Absolute Unity and Unrivalled Supremacy of Jehovah, the Almighty, All-wise, and All-gracious Creator and Preserver of all things, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and therefore, following what we think *the absolute commands of God himself*, we strictly confine our worship to GOD even the FATHER. See Matt. xx. 23; xxviii. 18; Mark xiii. 32; John v. 26, 27, 30; vii. 16; xii. 49; xiv. 10, 28; Eph. i. 17, 19, 22.

Nevertheless, we cordially receive whatever the *Scriptures* teach respecting the Lord Jesus Christ. We believe in his divine authority; that his words are the words of the Father who sent him; that for his obedience unto death, GOD exalted him to be Lord over the dead and living, and to be our final Judge; and that he is therefore entitled to our *reverence, faith*, and *submissive obedience*. We believe that he gave himself for us, to redeem us from all iniquity; that by his submitting unto death, even the death of the cross, he conveyed and assured to us the blessings of the new covenant, pardon and everlasting life; that we have redemption *through* his blood, even the forgiveness of sins; and that he is therefore entitled to our warmest *gratitude and love*. We believe that he set us a perfect example of piety towards God and love to man, of humility, patience, self-denial, and all other virtues; and that he is therefore entitled to our *admiring veneration*.

We do not believe the Holy Spirit, or Spirit of God, to be a distinct being from God himself. We regard the expression as denoting, in the Scriptures, either God himself, or most commonly, the influence or agency of God in whatever way employed, and particularly his miraculous agency.

The Gospel appears to us to *promise* its blessings of forgiveness and eternal salvation, only to those who comply with its terms, 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ,'—such faith as produces religious obedience, the regulation of the heart and life by Christian principles and precepts. Nevertheless, we believe, that 'in every nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.'—We reject, as utterly unscriptural, the doctrine of Satisfaction, and every other which represents the death of Christ as rendering God merciful, or as enabling Him to extend his mercy to the sinner: but we feel the sinner's hope to be abundantly strong and consoling, while resting on the covenant of grace, made by the God of love and mercy with his guilty creatures, through his beloved Son and Servant, Jesus Christ, sealed by the blood of our Saviour, and attested by the mighty power of his God and Father. *We depend, not on our own merits, nor on the merits of any other being, but on the grace of God in Christ.*

As to the precise nature and duration of the future punishment of the wicked, there is among Unitarians, as among other sects of Christians, much diversity of opinion; but that they will be great and dreadful we all agree. We receive, with profound reverence, the awful declarations of Revelation respecting it. We believe that 'we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that 'he who soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption:' and that 'indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,' will be awarded 'to every one who doeth evil,' in the day when God 'shall judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained.'

Such are the religious opinions which are so much and so unjustly 'spoken against.' Unitarians have no *Creed*, no Rule of faith or practice, except the Scriptures. They maintain the right, and feel the duty, of private judgment; and therefore there must be among them differences in opinion, and in modes of expression. But the foregoing may be depended upon as a correct representation of the sentiments of Unitarians in general.

'Whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.'—'He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is who loveth me.' Such are the words of the Lord Jesus.

'*If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's.*'

REMARKS.

We regret that the limits of our paper, lessened by the claims of our correspondents, will not permit us to examine in detail the above 'Appeal.' We remark, however, as our opinion, that had this 'Appeal' been published to the world, *previously* to the delivery of the 'sermon before the New-England Society,' by Gardiner Spring, it would have operated upon his mind, sufficiently to have *softened* the asperity of his *aspersion* of their principles, and their tendency. For we question whether any person in the quiet possession of his reason, can read 'Hopkins' System of Doctrines' without noticing their *inconsistency*, or observe their *effects*, on his *disciples*, without tracing by analogy the *cause*;—and this Appeal, having the same *claims* to admiration, with 'Hopkins' doctrines,' we think it would be very uncharitable, to suppose that it would not have the same *effect!* And so long as inconsistency, and absurdity, is the road to ecclesiastical preferment and honour, we think the Hopkinsians, and Unitarians, have equal claims; and that the smiles and sympathy of the public should be distributed with equal hand on all occasions, where they *rise*, or fall, in the tube of the orthodox thermometer. They appear to be graduated upon the same *scale*, and it only requires an uniformity in the state of the religious atmosphere, to make them rise or fall together!

There exists, of necessity, in all hypotheses, (as in truth, of which they are a *substitute*,) primary, or leading principles. And these principles being *premisses*, from which all their conclusions are *pretended* to be deduced, and which conclusions in all their ramifications, in the aggregate, composing the whole of the hypothesis, there is a key to them, which will not only unravel their mysteries, but detect their errors, by showing their incongruity, and the inconsistency of the conclusions with their pretended premisses. There exists a striking likeness between the Hopkinsian and Unitarian premisses; and, as might be expected, a great similarity in their conclusions. And as it is an established fact, that there is not, even in nature, any two things of the same species perfectly alike in all their appearances; so, of necessity, there must exist a dissimilarity in appearance, even between these. Destructive *effects*, however diverse in appearance their origin, have one strong claim to affinity; for *causes* which produce much mischief, must always be classed together. And when effects are the same, or nearly alike, it is rational to view them according to their nature, and measure them by their utility, or the mischief which they may occasion by the pernicious contagion of example.

The Unitarians and Hopkinsians, both profess to believe in *one* Supreme Cause of all things; *and both deny the Divinity of Jesus Christ.* They both profess to believe in an *Universal* atonement; and both *deny* the extent of the Atonement. Therefore, they both *contradict* their own premisses; and contend for conclusions, which, if *true*, would damn themselves. Our first position, that Unitarians and Hopkinsians profess to believe in *one* Supreme Cause of all things, we think will readily be admitted by all. That they both *deny* the *Divinity* of Christ, we shall *prove*. And what may, to some, seem a paradox, they both *confess* it in *fact;* and then, as it were, by mutual consent, *deny* it in *fact!* That the reader may clearly understand the ground we have taken—that the *comparative* merits of the parties may be seen, stripped of the tinsel and gauze of polemic equivocation—and that each, divested of the prejudices of the other, may rest upon its own merits, and father its own absurdities, we shall, first, inquire what is meant by '*Divinity*;' and then the claims of the contending parties to a pre-eminency in orthodoxy will be manifest.

(*To be concluded next week.*)

TO CORRESPONDENTS

Gideon and J.C. are received, and will be published; and Philo-Logos. Philotheus is received; but, if he wishes his sentiments to be published in the Gospel Herald, in their *present* shape, our Prospectus will inform him of the conditions. If he prefers altering the phraseology, he can obtain his communication at the office by asking for it.

Errata.—Page 184, 1st col. 22d line from the top for *Heb.* iii. 6. read *Hab.* iii. 6.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 10, 1821. NO. 47.

Remarks on the 'Unitarians' Appeal.'

[*Concluded.*]

The term Divinity, or *Divine*, as used and applied to the Deity, is considered as referring *to*, and including in *it*, the Being, Attributes, and Purposes, of the Deity. And that all creatures in contradistinction to the Deity, have no claims to the character of Divine in their *being*, which is finite; or in their *qualities*, or any thing which can justly be attributed to them, which are mutable; or in their *purposes*, which are peccable. God, therefore, is admitted to be alone Divine. And the character of God, is the only proper and exclusive Divine Character in the universe; and the Scriptures being a revelation from God, contain descriptions of his character given by himself; and are, therefore, a criterion by which we are to judge, and a rule by which we are to measure our conceptions of Him; whether of his Being, Attributes, or Purposes. To speak of the *perfections* of Deity, *abstractedly* considered from his Being, Attributes, or Purposes, is either an unmeaning redundancy of expression, or betrays an ignorance of his character. By the character of the Deity we would be understood to mean his Being, Attributes, and Purposes;—and God being perfect in his Being, Attributes, and Purposes, they are of necessity his *Perfections!* 'God is perfect in *all* his ways.' The character of God, therefore, is alone *Divine*—and the Scriptures of necessity the only medium, by which we can *define* the term. It is remarkable, that the character of God, as given in the Scriptures, is not in the *abstract*, in the declaration that '*God is Love*'—but in the *whole!* And when it is farther declared, that 'He doth not afflict *willingly*, nor grieve the children of men;' and it is added, that 'out of the *multitude of his mercies he will have compassion*,' nothing short of the most unqualified infidelity can deny that '*God is Love!*' There never lived the man, of Adam's race, who did not *hate*. Here exists, in all its majesty, the grand, the incontrovertible distinction. Here the Deity stands revealed—Here is the *Divinity*, and it '*is Love!*' Is it objected, here is not *all*, the Deity is *just*;—the Deity has answered—he has declared that He is 'a *just* God, and *Saviour!*'

The definition of the term Divinity, or *Divine*, therefore, as given by the *Divine Being* in the revelation which He has made to man in the Scriptures of Holy Inspiration, is 'LOVE!' And the voice of Inspiration has declared, that '*Love is the fulfilling of the law.*' Which, by a wonderful coincidence of expression, proves beyond the possibility of refutation, that the *Divine God of Love* requires nothing but *Love;*—and the declaration, 'Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the *law*, till all be *fulfilled*,' proves to a demonstration, not only that all shall *know* and *love God* from the least unto the greatest, but that the *purposes* of God are *Love*, and that *Love shall* be the result! Therefore, none but a Being who is Almighty in power—Infinite in wisdom—and Unbounded in goodness, '*Is Love!*' And none but the Being who '*is Love*,' is DIVINE! The Lord Jesus Christ is *Almighty* in power; for He said, '*All* power in heaven and earth was His!' The Lord Jesus Christ is *Infinite* in wisdom; for He said, 'I and the Father are *one!*' And the Lord Jesus Christ is *Unbounded* in goodness; for he forgave those, by whose hands he was slain! 'And having made *peace* through the blood of his cross, by *him* to *reconcile all* things unto *himself*,'—and the declaration of an inspired apostle, that '*God* was *in* Christ reconciling the world unto *himself*,' proves the *Unity* of God,—the *Divinity* of the Lord Jesus Christ—and that '*in* him dwelling the *fulness* of the Godhead bodily,' *he* is 'Immanuel, *God* with us!'

Considering the *Divinity* of the Lord Jesus Christ incontrovertibly proved, and explained, we shall examine the claims of the Hopkinsians to orthodoxy on the ground of *acknowledging* it, and the *objections* of the Unitarians *to* the acknowledgment *of* it; and with the exception of a little allowance for the extra sincerity of the Unitarians, show that their pretensions are as *equal*, as their conclusions are *absurd* and contradictory.

It should never be forgotten that the titles of 'Immanuel, God with us,' are the exclusive titles of Deity, and being *Divine*, belong to Him *alone!* And in the Hebrew, the term translated LORD is uniformly the same with JEHOVAH. Of the Word, (which 'was God,') in the *flesh*, it is declared, that his name shall be called 'Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.' And it is obvious, that the application of these *titles* to the Lord Jesus Christ, would not *make* him to *be* a 'Mighty God,' or 'the Everlasting Father;' and except he was, in *reality*, what these titles designate, it would be promulgating a *falsehood* to apply them *to* him; and would be giving the *glory* of God to *another!* The advent of the Saviour, or the Word being made *flesh*, is thus alluded to by the Holy Spirit of truth, speaking by the Psalmist. (xxiv.) 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord (Jehovah) strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle. Who is this King of glory? The Lord (Jehovah) of hosts, He *is* the King of glory!' Isaiah xxxiii. 22. 'For the LORD (Jehovah) *is* our Judge; the Lord (Jehovah) *is* our lawgiver; the Lord (Jehovah) *is* our King; *He will save us.*' Who is this *King?* this Lord, *Jehovah?* 'Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy *King* cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.' Matt. xxi. 5. He is, therefore, the *Lord, Jehovah—Jesus, the Saviour—Christ, the Anointed!* The prophet declares positively, that '*Jehovah* is our *Judge*, and he *will* save us.' The Unitarians say, that the Lord Jesus Christ is to be our Judge, and deny that he is *Jehovah!* It is impossible to name the Lord Jesus Christ, and admit these *three* appellations to be his, without tacitly admitting (however unwillingly) that *he is* Jehovah, the Saviour, beside whom there is none else, tabernacled in the *flesh;* which *anointed* by his indwelling is the Christ. And it is likewise evident, that any *partial* admission of the truth, in any shape, is not the faith of the Scriptures; and that error exists in proportion as truth is rejected, and denied. The declaration of Jesus, 'For if ye believe not that *I am*, ye shall die in your sins;' is not only assuming the name or title of God, Jehovah, *I am*, but draws the *line*, and proves that he is the 'Everlasting Father,' and Saviour of the world. A denial or rejection of this truth, is a denial and rejection of the Divinity of Christ; and here the Hopkinsians and Unitarians are upon a level. Here their premises are yoked together. They both *confess* that Jesus Christ made atonement for *all men;* and both *deny* that *all* men are the saved of the Lord! The Appeal declares, 'We believe that he gave himself for us; to redeem us from *all* iniquity; that by his submitting unto death, even the death of the cross, he *conveyed* and *assured* to us the blessings of the new covenant, *pardon* and everlasting life; that we *have redemption through* his blood, even the *forgiveness* of sins.' Look at this—'The Gospel appears to us to *promise its blessings* of forgiveness and eternal salvation, *only to those* who comply with its terms,' &c. And, 'We depend, not on our *own* merits, nor on the merits of any *other* being, but on the *grace* of God *in* Christ.' Of the 'future punishment of the wicked,' they say, 'that they will be great and dreadful, we all agree!' For inconsistency, this rivals Hopkins in his wildest vagaries. First declare, that Christ, in the *past* tense, '*conveyed* and *assured*' unto man, '*pardon* and everlasting life,' and call *these* the '*blessings* of the new covenant,' and 'that we *have* (strong language this) redemption, &c., *even* the forgiveness of sins;' and then say, that 'the Gospel *appears* to us to *promise* its *blessings* of forgiveness and eternal salvation, *only* to those,' &c.,—and then, as it were to soar above even the climax of absurdity itself, declare, 'We depend, *not* on our *own* merits, nor on the merits of any *other* being,' &c. &c. Now we very much question, whether the Unitarian clergyman, who wrote this Appeal, would consider his *salary* 'assured and *conveyed*' to him, should his congregation, instead of paying him, inflict 'very great and dreadful punishment' upon him; and in answer to any remonstrances he might make, tell him, that although his *preaching* 'conveyed and assured' to him his *salary*, still, 'it appears to *us*,' that we 'promised' to pay it '*only*' in case you would do something else! And we think the reasonableness of this would appear in a very shining light, if they were to add, you must depend for the payment of your salary, not on any other services which you may render, but on your 'preaching *alone!*' This, we think, is in the true Hopkinsian style. And we cannot conceive how any of his disciples can read it, without experiencing emotions bordering upon rapture. Compare the Hopkinsian—'Christ died, not for the elect, or non-elect, as such, but for *all* men as sinners. He made a complete atonement for the sins of the whole world!' We have seen how this '*appears*' to the Unitarian. Hear the Hopkinsian—'If they are not *elected*, they will indeed *perish!*' In both cases, it is *only those*, &c. &c. The only difference is the name—one says, 'only to those who comply with its terms,'—the other, the same, with the small addition of giving a name to the 'only those,' and calling them the '*elect.*' Now we are sorry to see friends fall out. We think when conclusions meet and *kiss* each other, that premises might at least *shake hands* together; and the manufacturers of each commodity, live in peace and amity.

We have seen that the *Divinity* of the Saviour, is the Almighty power to *save*,—the Infinite wisdom which devises the means to *save*,—and the *Love* which prompts to use the means, and effect the salvation of the *world!* We have seen that the Hopkinsians and Unitarians *deny* the Divinity of Christ, by denying the *salvation of all men in Christ.* 'For if ye believe not that *I am*, ye shall die in your sins.' If we believe that 'God is Love;' and the Saviour of all men, we acknowledge his Divinity—but if we believe that God, in Christ, is a being who *hates*, and destroys, we degrade him to a level with the adversary of God and man, the destroyer; and *deny* his Divinity! If the reverse of our premises are truth, the conclusion is inevitable, that Satan himself has claims to divinity! But our premises alone *must* be truth; for 'God is Love.'

The following criterion introduced by the Unitarians in their Appeal, shall be the touchstone—'It is indeed impossible that revealed truth can be *inconsistent* with itself; and we hold that whatever (through the imperfection of human language) is *obscure*, or of *doubtful* meaning, *ought*, in reason and common sense, to be interpreted by the *clear* and *express* declarations of the *Scriptures* in other parts.' We ask, applying this rule, what shall be done with their quotation from Mark xiii. 32? This, they have quoted *at large!* And it would be an insult to their reputation for learning, &c., to suppose them ignorant of the fact, that in this passage, the words, '*neither the Son*,' are not to be found in either of the accounts of this very declaration of Christ, as given by the other evangelists; and that *Ambrose* in his time, says it is *wanting* in some Greek copies.

Is it consistent with reason and Scripture, to suppose Christ *ignorant* of the happening of an event which was predicted by Daniel 500 years before it happened? Do not the Scriptures declare, that the 'testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy?' Is the *Spirit* of prophecy ignorant of the happening of those events which it foretells? Is it not absurd to admit Christ to possess Almighty power, and then deny that he is Infinite in *wisdom*?

We likewise notice, in particular, the passage referred to, see Matt. xx. 23. 'And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with; but to sit on my right hand, and on my left is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father.' The reader will notice that the words printed in italics, namely, '*it shall be given to them*,' are a supply by the translators, and are not found in the original. Consequently, Christ does not say, it 'is not *his* to *give*,' in the sense this supply would make it—but qualifies it, thus—'is not mine to give, *but for whom* it is prepared of my Father.' We consider that cause built on a weak foundation which resorts to such equivocal helps to support it! And we remark, for the information of the young and inexperienced, that all the words printed in *italics* in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, are supplied by the translators, and not to be found in the originals.

Our limits not admitting an examination in detail, of all the passages referred to, we shall, after requesting the reader to recollect the rule laid down by the Unitarians themselves for the understanding of the Scriptures, refer to several passages, and confidently hope, the diligent and sincere inquirer after truth will examine them with that attention which their importance merits. We, however, previously make one remark, and we think it a very important one—Every passage which proves the *Unity* of God, proves of necessity the *Divinity* of the Lord Jesus Christ. The reader by comparing the following quotations of this Appeal, with Matt. i. 21. Isaiah xliii. 3, 14, 25; Acts iv. 12; will be satisfied, we trust, of its truth. Deut. iv. 35; vi. 4; xxxii. 39; Isaiah xlv. 5, 21, 22, &c.

To prove that the Lord Jesus Christ is not the only *one* God and Saviour, they quote as follows—Phil. iv. 6, 7. See also iii. 20, 21. Mark. xii. 29, 32. See 35, 36, 37. Isaiah lii. 13. See liv. 5; ix. 6, 7; lxiii. 1—6; John i. 1—4, and 14. Matt. xxviii. 18. See John xvii. 5; xvi. 28. John v. 26, 27, 30. See 19—25, and 43; x. 30. John vii. 16. See v. 19, 20. xii. 49. See 44th verse. John xiv. 10, 28. See 6—11. We consider this chapter proves the Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, that in him dwelleth the fulness of God, and that the Christ, the Humanity, is united, and one with the *Father*, the Divinity, beyond the possibility of refutation. Ephes i. 17, 19, 22. See Phil. ii. 10, 11; Isaiah xlv. 22—25. We believe, that the Father is *in* Christ the anointed; and that the *Son* of God, or *Word* which proceedeth from the *Father*, as flame and heat proceedeth from *fire*, (and the fire not seen) spoke from the *flesh*, the Christ, who is the Head of every man, and was manifested in the person of the Redeemer, God with us. Therefore, the declaration 'He that hath seen *me* (the Word) hath seen the Father,' is an unanswerable argument against the doctrine of a *Trinity* of Persons, and proves incontestably the *Unity* of God, and the Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ; who is the *Lord*, Jehovah, or Father—*Jesus*, Saviour, or Redeemer—and *Christ*, the Humanity, Divine, and united with the Father, who is the Head of Christ, and Christ the Head of every man! The Father is *greater* than the Humanity, and the Father and Word are coexistent, and united, and one, dwelling in Christ. We consider this distinction important, and as true, as it is obvious—for if the Father is not greater than the *Humanity*, it follows of necessity, that man, the creature, is as great as the Father, in at least some sense; for all men being members of the Humanity, and every member, however mean its office, in its disposition as to place in the body, being necessary, man would be necessary to God; indispensably so; which cannot be admitted, without derogating from his character as Infinite, and Independent. The Lord Jesus Christ, is a 'name, which is above every name.' For it is *Lord*, Jehovah—*Jesus*, Saviour—*Christ*, Anointed by the indwelling of the Godhead bodily. For the Spirit is poured out upon him, *without measure*.

To Edward Sharman, Springfield N. J.

Sir,—The Editor is under the necessity of informing you, that, although the Prospectus of the 'Gospel Herald' makes it his duty to *publish* the sentiments of his correspondents, it does not oblige him to *advertise* them! And farther—It is understood, that a correspondent is to reply in *form*, especially in answer to interrogatories; and to either *admit*, or, at least, attempt to *controvert* by other testimony than his *own* assertions, the premises of his opponent. Your *third*, and last communication, is the same in substance, and with a little variation, the same in the phraseology, with your *second;* which varied from your *first*, more in its length, than in its contents.

The following, which is affixed to your communication in the shape of a Postscript, varying in its matter a little from your communications, we conceive it our duty to publish it.

'P.S. Mr. Editor, you appear somewhat alarmed at the prosperity of the Unitarians in your city, and exclaim against them as destroying the *essence* of your *religion*, and sapping the *corner-stone* of your Christianity. And, indeed, you have great reason to tremble for the fate of your popular plan of invocation; for its total destruction is as certain, as the power of the Almighty is superior to your's. The Unitarian mode of worshipping but *one* person, even the Father, is of God, and all the power of earth and hell cannot overthrow it. I would remind you, that while you oppose the *two opposite unities* of Jehovah and his messenger, the Messiah, as claiming a distinct and *unequal* regard, you are at war with the Lamb, and his heavenly doctrine; and the Lamb shall overcome you, for he must reign till all the enemies to his own *Unity* and claims, and the *Unity* and claims of his heavenly Father, are conquered or destroyed. And it might not be amiss for Christians to refrain from censuring Unitarians, and let them alone; for though they are but few in number, and their strength and influence very small,—so long as King Jesus is their Captain, their Patron, and their Advocate, and his Almighty Father their All-sufficient God, they have nothing to fear from the myriads of their violent opposers; but are sure to come off conquerors through him who has loved them, and promised to crown them with his well done, good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joy of your Lord.'

REMARKS.

We do not recollect of exclaiming against the Unitarians for 'destroying the *essence* of *our* religion,' for we consider them ignorant of it, and unable to do it. And Christ being our *corner-stone*, and possessing Almighty power, we have no fears for that neither! And until our correspondent explains his phrase, *opposite unities*, and proves the propriety of his application of it, we shall pass it by. We, however, do not recollect any passage in the Scriptures, where it is *promised to crown the Unitarians*, &c.;—But, on the other hand, if they, themselves, are to be taken in evidence, (and they say, 'The Gospel appears to us to *promise* its blessings of forgiveness and eternal salvation, *only* to those who comply with its *terms*, 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ,' such faith as produces religious obedience, the regulation of the heart and life by Christian principles and precepts,') we fear they will not receive the *crown*, on these, their conditions. For we question whether '*faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ, consists in *contradicting* his positive testimony, and denying that he *existed* at all, *before* he was born of the Virgin Mary, when he declared, '*Before* Abraham was, *I am!*' And, 'that all should honour the *Son*, even as they honour the *Father!*'

Remarks on the Atonement.

Heb. x. 5, 6, 7, 10, 12. 'Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, *Sacrifice* and offering thou wouldest *not*, but a *body* hast thou prepared me; in burnt-offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hast had *no pleasure:* Then said I, Lo, I come, (in the volume of the Book it is written of me,) to *do thy will*, O God. By the *which will* we are *sanctified* through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ, once *for all*. But this man after he had offered one *sacrifice* for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God,' &c. This sacrifice, therefore, was the *body* of Christ. What is the *body* of Christ? Ans. See Ephes. i. 22, 23. 'And gave him (not, '*to be*,' for he is) the *Head* over all to the *Church*, which is his *body*, the fulness of him that filleth *all* in *all!*' Again, 'Be it known unto you, that Christ is the Head of *every* man. We are the members of his *body;* of his *flesh*, and of his bones.' And the declaration of Christ, 'The *flesh* profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, are *Spirit*, and are *life*,' prove that we are members of Christ's *spiritual body!* How, then, we ask, could Christ be a *vicarious sacrifice*, (a substitute for us, and instead of us,) when 'we were crucified *with* him—buried *with* him—and have risen *with* him—and sit in heavenly places *in* Christ?' And except this is truth, where can be the propriety of saying, 'That God hath given to *us* eternal *life*, and this life is *in* his *Son*?' 1 John v. 11. We admit that Paul declares, 'Without shedding of *blood* there is no remission of sins;' and we must admit, likewise, that Jesus took the cup after supper, and said, 'This *cup is* the new testament, in my *blood*, which is shed for you;' and Christ's own definition, makes this *blood spiritual*. It would be absurd to say, that our bodies of *flesh* were drawn unto him, and crucified with him; for 'the flesh profiteth nothing.' The *will* of God *is* our sanctification; and the medium is through the offering of, and our knowledge that the *body* of Christ, (all men, perfect by their union with him,) was offered as a Lamb without blemish, and was a sweet smelling savour unto the Lord. 'Behold, to *obey* is *better* than sacrifice.' But go ye and learn what *that* meaneth, *I will have mercy* and not sacrifice; for I am *not* come to call the righteous, but *sinners* to repentance.' Matt. ix. 13.

Note. Christ was '*delivered for* our offences.' If man had not *strayed* through the deceitfulness of sin *from* God, it would have been unnecessary to reconcile man *to* God; for he never would have been in a state of *unreconciliation!* If man had never *changed* or strayed, and God had *changed*, and become the *enemy* of man, then it would be necessary to reconcile *God* to man; and the common understanding of Christ's being a *vicarious* sacrifice to appease the wrath of God, and make him favourable, would look a little more reasonable!

What should we say of an earthly father, who had *ten* sons who had rebelled against him, and despised his counsel and authority, and who, roused to vengeance at their ingratitude, would be appeased on no other condition than the sacrifice of an only obedient child, whose meat and drink had been to do the will of his father; and who subjected his innocent son to a cruel death for the crimes of the guilty? We should justly call him a tyrant! But 'Our God is merciful.' He loved his rebellious children—He rended the heavens and came down; he made flesh his tabernacle, and dwelt among us—He '*was in Christ* reconciling the world (his ignorant rebellious children) unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them'—His language is, 'Return unto me, for I have redeemed thee'—'Come, and let us reason together; though your sins are as scarlet, or as crimson, they shall be as wool, or as snow'—'He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied;' the 'Heathen *are* his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth *are* his possession—All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name; all the ends of the world shall remember, and turn unto the Lord; all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee; for thou art great, and doest wonderous things; *Thou art God alone!*'

Reader, compare the following with your Bible, and then decide for yourself.

God so *hated* the world, that his only begotten Son gave *himself* as a *vicarious* sacrifice (instead of and) for the world, to satisfy the *vindictive* justice of God, &c. 'God so *loved* the world, that *he gave his* only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish,' &c.

Quere. Do the words 'God so *loved*' and God '*gave his*,' &c., mean that the *Son* came of his *own* accord? and that if the *Son* had possessed the same *vindictive* Spirit of the Father, that he would have *hated* the world *too*? Do they prove that the Father *hated*, and was determined to punish, and that the Son *loved*, and was determined if he did *punish*, he should punish *him* in the *stead* of the *guilty*? See John v. 19.

Signs of the Times.

The most prominent object in the religious hemisphere, at the present time, is the missionary comet, which is now visible in the latitude of Baltimore. This comet has for some time passed in a southerly direction, and dragged its tail through the columns of most of the newspapers. Having frequently given opinions relative to the nature of the comet itself, we shall now express an opinion of, not the *light*, but the *dark* stream that is emitted from it, in its erratic course. The tail of this comet has the following divisions visible to the naked eye. 'Necessity of Christianity to India—The progress of Christianity in India—Native missionary college at Serampore,' &c. &c. In the first division are discovered '*Three hundred, and thirty millions of gods!*' According to this, and admitting the population of India, as stated, to be '150,000,000,' every inhabitant has *two* gods to himself—and supposing they were to put them all into common stock, and every man worship his own, and his neighbour's gods, it would require a pretty long life, we think, to offer an oblation to *each*, and pay homage to *all!* When our evangelical *astronomers*, the missionaries, will give the names of *one half* these gods, we shall have no objection to give them credit for the existence of the *remainder!*

And the following, which in our opinion is plain to the naked eye. 'No other *expectation* at death, than that of transmigration into the body of some reptile.' And what other *expectation* have these evangelizing Calvinists? Ans. If you are one of the *few* elect, you shall be happy; but, if you are one of the *many* non-elect, you shall be *transmigrated*, not into the '*body* of some reptile,' that would be a *blessing*, but into the *body* of *interminable fire!*

In the second division, is the following, which is seen, and its falsehood detected by the help of the Scripture telescope. 'If all India is *ever* to be *taught*, it *must* be by the Christian knowledge, the talents and *zeal* of its Christianized *population*.' When the glorious Saviour of the world was tabernacled in the flesh, he said, '*And they shall be all taught of God.*' Isaiah ix. 7. Speaking of Christ, it is said, 'Of the increase of *his* government and peace *there shall be* no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The *zeal* of the *Lord* of hosts *will perform this*;' not the '*zeal* of the Christianized *population of India!*

In the third division of this comet's tail is the following—'By all that is *tremendous* in the *future* prospects of 150,000,000, of beings equally rational and immortal with ourselves,' &c. Now, we ask, What is there so '*tremendous* in their *future* prospects?' Do the missionaries preach the *Gospel?* Is not the Gospel *good news?* The Gospel which *God* preached to Abraham, was, that 'In his Seed, (Christ,) all the *families* of the earth shall be *blessed!*' Is the prospect of being *blessed*, a *tremendous* prospect? And will you presume to say the Heathen will *not* be blessed, when Jehovah has *Sworn* they *shall be?* They are given to Christ; they are 'his *inheritance!*' And Christ (so says the prophet) will 'inherit (even) the desolate heritages!' Where is the *sincerity* in all this missionary blustering? Let them be taken at their word—Let these pretenders to a solicitude and anxiety and concern, for the souls of these Heathen, whom they represent as rushing to eternal destruction by hundreds of millions, for want of *their preaching*—Let them 'manifest their *faith* by their *works*;' and instead of rioting in luxury, and swimming in extravagance,—instead of wringing from the mouth of labour the hard-earned pittance, let them set an example, and divesting themselves of their equipages, leave the loaves and fishes behind them, and then they shall be entitled to the praise of, at least, being *consistent*. In their own language—these Heathen are 'beings equally rational and immortal with ourselves.' How, then, can they hesitate a moment—their salaries of $ and $4000 per annum, are sufficient for an outfit—rush to the scene of combat where millions are perishing eternally for want of *you*, and confide the care of your congregations to your elders and deacons!

Pharisaism in Miniature.

It was noticed in several newspapers a short time since, that a little girl in New-Haven, had for some weeks abstained from the use of *butter*, and had given the avails to Rev. Mr. Ward;—A lady of the town of ——, after reading the account to her little son of *nine* years old, asked him if he should be willing to do as the little girl had done; 'Yes ma'm,' said he, '*if they will put it in the newspapers.*' Don't laugh at the boy; he has not yet learned to conceal his heart.

Hartford Times.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

Sir—An exposition of Acts xiii. 48, will much oblige a Subscriber This is said to be unintelligible to our good Presbyterians.

C. S. W.

New-Haven, Feb. 12, 1821.

Acts xiii. 48.

"*And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord; and as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed.*"

There is a misconstruction of this passage. Some suppose Calvin's doctrine of Election and Reprobation to be taught here; to wit, that *literally*, as *many* as were (fore) *ordained* to eternal life *believed*. Were there no others (fore) ordained, &c., but those who heard and believed at *this* time? If not, what will become of all the generations of men since that time? Or shall it be *qualified?* If so, by what rule? Supposing the apostles, *after* that time, preached to the *same* people who did not believe when they *first* heard them, would it be possible for them to be *saved?* By consulting the context, we are instructed that almost the whole city of Antioch came together to hear the preaching of Paul and Barnabas; and the Jews were filled with envy, and contradicted Paul and Barnabas, blaspheming, &c. Christ declared, 'No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him. And no man can go to the Father but by me.' Now, it is not declared that as many as were *fore-ordained*, &c., believed; and the uniform testimony of the Scriptures, is, that faith is the gift of God; and the passage under consideration, is therefore explained. For, although we should have no objection to believers in election and reprobation being accommodated in this instance, with a phrase which is so necessary for them, to preserve even the appearance of consistency, as the term elected, or fore-ordained, they being not only harmless, but in their proper connexion consolatory, still, with a view to a correct understanding of the passage, we contend that no such construction can with any propriety be put upon it. The *ordaining* here, is but a convertible mode of expression for *giving* knowledge, which enables the receiver to believe. And the *truth* which they believed, was, that the salvation of God was to '*the ends of the earth.*' They glorified the word of the Lord. But the Jews, who preferred a different *word*, who wanted a salvation and forgiveness of sins through another medium than Christ, and who disliked an Universal Salvation, like thousands in our day, they 'were filled with envy, and contradicted and blasphemed.' Confute the apostles' doctrine, they could not do!

Quere. Supposing we were to say, that as many as were MADE *to understand* the things of the kingdom, believed—or as many as were *made* to believe, entered into the kingdom? 'For it *is* life eternal to know God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.' Should any Calvinist *contradict* our exposition, we merely request him to examine the original, and prove, (if he can,) that the word rendered *ordained*, should be translated *fore-ordained*, instead of *made*.

The Death Bed.

The following is an extract from a letter addressed to the Editor of the Albany Register, by the Rev. Hooper Cumming, giving an account of his interview with the late lamented Maj. Birdsall; after he received the wound which terminated his earthly existence.

"I proposed a variety of questions in order to ascertain his sentiments on the subject of religion, and the actual state of his *feelings*. I inquired whether he believed that the Lord Jesus Christ was the only Saviour of men? He answered, 'I do fully believe it.' 'Do you know that you are a sinner?' 'Ah yes! the very greatest that ever lived! Oh pray for my poor soul.' 'Are you willing to be saved solely through the righteousness of Christ?' 'I am.'—'Are you perfectly willing that he should have all the glory of your salvation?' 'Perfectly willing.' 'Do you consent cordially to the humiliating doctrine of the cross—that humiliating doctrine which utterly disrobes man of pride and glory, and gives all honour to God in Christ?' 'I do consent.' 'Are you willing to be saved as a beggar?' 'Yes, O yes.' 'Are you willing, should it please a merciful God to redeem your soul, to be pointed at by the holy angels when you shall arrive at heaven, as one who deserved to be plunged in perdition, and who was saved by grace alone?' 'I am altogether willing.' 'Do you then deserve to be sent to hell?' 'I do richly deserve it; I deserve nothing else.' 'Do you then feel in your inmost soul, that it would be altogether just in God to damn you?' 'Yes, it would be just; I do feel it.' 'Do you depend exclusively on the merits of the Son of God for salvation?'—'I depend on no one else.' 'Not on your present resolutions?' 'No.' 'Not on your vows of amendment of life should you recover?' 'Not at all.' 'Do you repent of your sins?' 'I am sorry that I have sinned against God."

Hooper Cumming is a professed Calvinist. And in his pulpit will tell you, that the *elect* who alone are to be saved, *were* (in the *past* tense) redeemed unto God by the death of his Son, &c. Now mark his consistency—he asked the dying man, 'Are you willing, should it please a merciful God *to redeem* (in the *future* tense) your soul, to be *pointed at* by the holy angels when you shall arrive at *heaven*, as one who *deserved* to be plunged in *perdition*, and who was saved by grace alone?' Reader, what do you think of this? What should you say of an earthly judge, whose servants '*pointed* at' those whom he loaded with favours, and exclaimed, 'There goes a man to *honour*, who, if he had his *deserts*, would go to the *gallows!*' And what would be the character of that *judge*, who exalted one criminal to *honour* and riches, and another by the *neck* with a *halter?* Now, it is our opinion, that the '*holy* angels' are better employed than to be '*pointing* their fingers' at those who 'arrive at heaven,' accusing a God of justice, of rewarding with heaven, wretches, who, if they had their *deserts*, would be yoked with devils, and consigned to hell! We think that such a comforter was not the *least* of the dying man's *sufferings!*

THE ORDEAL.

We understand a preacher of Hopkinsianism in this city, has improved upon the doctrine taught by the apostles of Christ, in the following manner. Instead of admitting applicants to Hopkins' church, by receiving, as did the apostles of Christ, an answer in the affirmative to the interrogatory whether they 'Believed in the Lord Jesus Christ'—

they are asked, '*Are you willing to be damned* and made miserable for ever, for the glory of God?' And all who prefer *hell* to heaven, are considered as '*born again!*' Now we are free to acknowledge, that a very great *change* is absolutely necessary to qualify any person for *this* church. But we think, that instead of being *born*, they, to use a technical term, make a mal-presentation; and are turned *backward* to greater *darkness!* We pity the delusions of these poor creatures, who submit to be so egregiously imposed upon; and confidently hope, that none of them will be 'taken at their *word*;' for we are confident, that after the novelty of the thing wore off, and we believe that would soon happen, they would find 'eternal misery' a very unpleasant and bitter pill. Surely these are days big with wonders. And we hope we shall be thought excusable for not stifling the remark, that even the apostle Paul, if he were permitted to revisit this earth and come to New-York, would be astonished at the improvements in theology made since his time; and at the superior sagacity of Hopkins' disciples, and their admirable prudence and precaution, compared with himself and his cotemporaries!

MOSES' SONG.

Deut. xxxii. 39—43. 'See now that I, *even* I, *am* he, and *there* is no god with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal: neither that can deliver out of my hand. For I lift up my hand to heaven, and say, I live for ever. If I whet my glittering sword, and mine hand take hold on judgment, I will render vengeance to mine enemies, and I will reward them that hate me, I will make mine arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour flesh, &c. REJOICE, O YE NATIONS *his people; for he* will avenge the blood of his servants, and will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be merciful unto his land, to his people.'

The reader is requested to read with attention the whole of this song, beginning with the chapter. Moses, guided by the spirit of prophecy, sings of the mercy and judgments of God. Or rather of the *merciful judgments* of God; 'for *all his ways are judgment.*' Moses sings of the dealings of God with all men, his people. Compare Luke xv. 11—13, with the 8th verse of this chapter. Consider the younger son, figurative of the Gentiles, &c.; and the 9th verse, 'For the Lord's portion *is* his people; (but) Jacob *is* the *lot* of his inheritance,' as descriptive of Israel selected by God from all nations. The casting off of the Jews, is alluded to from the 20th to the 38th verse—the return of the Jews, with the fulness of the Gentiles, is the conclusion of this prophetic song. How different is the conduct of God, as described in this divine song, from the conduct of the *imaginary* gods of the believers in endless misery? Their gods kill, and *leave* the dead an eternal prey to death! They wound, and the wound is *left* to *fester*, and an endless gangrene is the consequence! But our God *kills*, but to make *alive;* and *wounds*, but to *heal!* He is the great Physician;—He heals all diseases; and restores his patients to a *life they cannot lose!*

From the Philadelphia Reformer.

MODERN MISSIONARIES.

[We have lately seen a pamphlet, entitled '*Thoughts on Missions*,' written by John Taylor of Kentucky, who states it as his belief, that 'religious society is much imposed upon by Missionaries, and that it is likely to be an increasing evil.' Mr. Taylor has been a preacher of respectable standing among the Baptists in those parts about 48 years; and we perceive by the Minutes of the Licking Association of Baptists, held at Rock Bridge, in September last, that this publication being presented to them, they recommended to their brethren the perusal of it.* We shall make such extracts from the work as our pages will admit. After stating the bodily affliction he laboured under, from which he never expected to recover, and complaining of some things among the Baptists which threw a shade over their councils, he observes:]

'But great as this evil may be in religious society, there is another in my belief much greater, though bearing the semblance, and innocence of a lamb, by which advantage is taken by many of our greatest men, and which has made a general sweep among Baptist associations, bearing all down before it. The deadly evil I have in view, is under the epithets or appellations of *Missionary Boards, Conventions, Societies,* and Theological Schools, all bearing the appearance of great, though affected sanctity, as the mystery of iniquity did in the days of Paul, when the man of sin was in embryo. Ten or twelve years ago, I obtained the use of two large octavo volumes of about 1000 pages, on the subject of Papal missions, in the new settlements of the great country of Paraguay, in South America. This great mission was conducted by the Jesuits, and from their statements great miracles were wrought by them among the natives. And all this is credible with Papists, as they think that miracles are yet in their church. According to their tales, thousands of the poor natives had been converted; for if they can only get them baptized, (old or young) converting work is done. These holy fathers gained such influence, power and wealth in Paraguay, that they at length held the king of Spain at defiance—and a heavy war ensued, and much blood shed, before they could be driven out of the country. Most of the Protestant Societies, since the days of Luther and Calvin, have had propensities to send out missionaries, as stated in a large work lately published in Philadelphia by Mr. Coles. This work contains about eleven hundred large octavo pages, including all the Protestant missions since the reformation by Luther. I have had patience to read it through, and though there are some things interesting in the work, the greater part is so romantic, that except the reader has more of faith than is needful to make a Christian, he sickens at the imposition or insult offered to his understanding.

'About eight or ten years past, (and previous to any Baptist Missionary Society in Kentucky,) two young men, by the names of Mills and Schermerhorn, being on a missionary tour, from the Presbyterian board of missions in the east, by their direction, were to travel through the states of Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, the Natchez settlement, and to New-Orleans; and then return to the board who sent them, make a report, by a faithful journal, of all the Missionary and Bible Societies they had formed, all the money they had collected, their success in preaching, &c. From Cincinnati in the State of Ohio, their object was to travel to Lexington in Kentucky. By an acquaintance of mine in Cincinnati, they were induced to travel sixty miles out of their way to see me, then living in the lower end of Gallatin county. Their object of an interview with me, was to know the state of the Baptist Society in Kentucky, and shape their course accordingly. They were at my house about one day and night. They were respectable looking young men, well informed, and zealous in the cause in which they were employed. They gave me a full history of the ordination and mission of Messrs. Judson and Rice,* and the mighty effect it had on the people of New-England; and particularly this good effect, that many poor ministers could scarcely get their bread before, but by stirring up the people in the Mission cause, and getting them in the habit of giving their money, it was now cheerfully communicated by thousands, so that ministers who staid at home, were now richly supplied. Was all this priestly art? Those young visitants of mine were very sociable, and among other freedoms, asked me how I had got through the world, as they saw me then well settled, and now old; which led to another question, What amount of supplies I had generally received from the people for preaching? After having considered it very small indeed, and in a friendly way blamed the badness of my policy; after finding that the Baptists in Kentucky were a great people (from the copies of Minutes I presented them of different associations,) now about fifteen associations in the state, and about that number of churches in an adjacent county, they became quite impatient with my indolence, assuring me if I would only stir up the people to missions and Bible Society matters, I should find a great change in money affairs in favour of the preachers; urging by questions like this, Do you not know that when the springs are once opened they will always run? Only, said they, get the people in the habit of giving their money for any religious use, and they will continue to appropriate for all sacred purposes.*

'I have no doubt these young men meant friendship to me, and to preachers in general. And being in my own house, and these respectable young men being strangers, as also not of my own society, common modesty forbade my making as free as I should have done at another place and time.'

Speaking of one of their foreign missionaries, he says:

'The most we know of Mr. —— is from the letters of him and his wife. If we attend to the long, celebrated letters of Mrs. —— in the first report of the Board of Foreign Missions, it would look as if her husband had the same taste for money as the horse-leech has for blood. In the instance of the poor religious soldier in the Isle of France; this poor soldier from her own account, who had a family in the army, and his income but very sparingly supported them, paid eight dollars per month for several months together for the use of a room for Mr. —— to preach in. This poor soldier after all this [she states] gave us twenty dollars, and though he weeps much through religious affection when he parts with them at the Isle of France, yet these innocent missionaries bear away his twenty dollars, regardless of his family's wants; though they feel tender for the poor slaves at the same Island, wishing their house full of gold, that they might emancipate them all.'

(To be continued.)

* The following is an extract from the Minutes:—'The subject respecting Brother Taylor's book taken up: agreed to receive it and to recommend to our brethren, the perusal of it.'

* *Note by the Editors.*—It may be proper here to state, Mr. Taylor, throughout his publication, has mentioned names in full: but as we wish as much as possible to avoid personalities, while we exhibit facts, we shall sometimes substitute a dash in the place of the name.

* *Note by the Editors.*—It will be recollected that from the report of these young men, Lyman Beecher makes his estimate of the number of *qualified ministers* which are wanting in the western and southern states, and the *deplorable* state of the people with regard to *competent* religious instruction.

MORAVIANISM.

Jacob Behmen's books made some proselytes in England during the great rebellion. 'Dr. Pordage and his family were of this sect, who lived together in community, and pretended to hold visible and sensible communion with angels, whom they sometimes saw and sometimes *smelt.*'

From Calamy's Life of Baxter.

Scrap from one of Latimer's Sermons.

'Here were a goodly place to speak against our clergymen which go so gallant now-a-days. I hear some of them wear *velvet shoes* and slippers; such fellows are more meet to *dance* the morris-dance than to be admitted to preach. I pray God mend such worldly fellows; for else they be not meet to be preachers.'

Quere. How would clergymen in our days, with their $ and $4000 salaries, fare, if the pious Latimer (the martyr) was to be their inspector and judge?

TO CORRESPONDENTS

S. is received, and will be published.

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY AT $3 PER ANNUM, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1821. NO. 48.

An Exposition of Luke xvi.

Continued from page 153.

The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.

"And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom."

If any person should object to the view we have taken of the *figures* used in this parable, and contend that the *hell* here spoken of is the *place* of punishment of the departed *souls* of sinners, in a *future* state of being, and that this punishment will be *interminable*, we answer;—Paul triumphantly exclaims, 'O *hell*, where *is* thy *victory*?' See 1 Cor. xv. 55, where the very same word is translated *grave*, which is here rendered *hell!* We believe the reader must acknowledge, that the *grave*, which is the figure used in the parable, is the best that could have been selected to describe the condition of the Jews, the *rich man*, for 'the things which belong to their peace are hidden from their eyes.' And in this state of blindness, in which they are judicially sentenced until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, how appropriate is the figure introduced, that the rich man '*lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom?*' And how explanatory is the declaration of the apostle, see 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15, 16. 'But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which *veil* is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their hearts. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, *the veil shall be taken away.*' Abraham who believed God, and whose testimony, as well as the testimony of all the prophets, being recorded in the Old Testament, *Abraham* is, therefore, figurative of that *Testament* in which the Jews pretended to trust, and to which they looked; but being *blinded*, 'the veil is upon their *hearts*,' and as described in the parable, they 'see Abraham *afar off*'—and what do they behold? Not the testimony that united in its accomplishment, in the person of Christ, the Messiah! But they behold '*Lazarus*,' the Gentiles, in 'his *bosom*;' reposing in that *faith* which they were strangers to, and *comforted* with those *testimonies*; which they, in consequence of their *blindness*, misapplied and rejected!

We cannot refrain from expressing our astonishment, that any person should read this parable, and refer to the numerous testimonies explanatory of it, and not behold, and acknowledge, their wonderful application and harmony, and the union of the figure and the thing represented! Compared with the great whole, which is connected in this chapter, if we consider the wonderful connexion which subsists in all its parts, and the fitness of the figure with the thing represented, and the cloud of witnesses which swarm, as it were, in every part of the Divine Testimony, and with united voice, crowd the mind with proofs and illustrations, to what point, short of *annihilation*, shall the miserable, discordant, and disjointed attempts of pretenders to orthodoxy be reduced; who, in their futile and abortive attempts at exposition, draw a picture, whose shades, coloured with the darkness of their minds, and whose lines distorted by the insanity of a perverse and distracted imagination, produce a monster as frightful as chaos, and as cruel, as the mind that gave him birth?

'*And he cried, and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.*' This verse, were there no other circumstance or testimony connected with our view of this subject in the whole chapter, would be sufficient. We have seen the absurdity of supposing the 'bosom of Abraham to be the *heaven* of departed souls, and to the unprejudiced mind, this verse contains a prophetic reproof, which has now become history. The Jews look to Abraham, instead of Christ; and their present situation, so far from admitting of certainty for the future, in administering to the uncertainty of the present, by the joys which arise from the salvation of God in Christ, may well be compared to a drop, in contradistinction to the fulness there is in Jesus Christ, whom they have rejected. 'There is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus.' They who have *believed* have entered into *rest*. But the Jews have no rest in believing, for they have rejected the counsel of God against themselves. The Jews, therefore, cry to their 'Father Abraham for mercy,' instead of God in *Christ;* and all the consolation afforded them by Abraham (the Old Testament,) is, that they in their 'lifetime' (during the Mosaic dispensation, and Jewish Church state,) 'received good things, and likewise Lazarus [the Gentiles] evil things; but now he [the Gentiles] is comforted, and thou art tormented.' It is the '*flame*' of uncertainty which torments them, and which nothing can extinguish but the *water* of the Gospel. See James iii. 6.

'*And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence.*'

This '*gulf*' is the *faith* of Abraham, that 'in Christ all the families of the earth shall be blessed;' and this faith, like an unfathomable abyss, swallows up the believer, and is to the unbeliever [considered as the medium of peace] impassable; for 'no man can come to me except the Father *draw him*,' are the words of Christ.

'*Then he said, I pray thee, therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment.*' The candid reader will find no difficulty here, if he will consider, that in this parable the personating of the Jews and Gentiles, as the 'rich man and Lazarus,' necessarily introduces a species of comparison highly allegorical, or figurative. And with a view to teach his then present, and future disciples in the things belonging to his kingdom, Christ introduced this personification, and spoke of the future (his coming as related in Matt. xxiv. xxv. Luke xxi, &c., and the consequences) as though it were then past. Samaria may therefore be considered as the 'father's house.' For an account of the revolting of the *ten* tribes, see 1 Kings xii. The city of Samaria became the capital of the kingdom of Israel, and Jerusalem of Judah. These kingdoms, although in their division *ten* tribes revolted, which were afterwards known as the kingdom of Israel, and only *two* remained faithful to Solomon's successor, and constituted the kingdom of Judah, still their division is considered as numerically equal, and those *ten* tribes who dwelt at Samaria, &c., answer to the '*five* brethren' in the parable. Ezek. xxxvii. 16, 17. 'Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions; then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and all the house of Israel his companions; and join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand. See the prophecy of Jacob, Gen. xlix. 5—7. Of Simeon and Levi, he says, 'I will *divide* them in Jacob, and *scatter* them in Israel;' consequently, *five* can be considered as one half of the whole, until the joining of the sticks, as mentioned by the prophet, when Ephraim and Manasseh are included, and make the number complete. The request of the 'rich man,' that 'Lazarus might be sent to his five brethren,' is very significant and expressive. And we shall see that the goodness of God manifested in the casting off of the Jews, whether at Jerusalem or Samaria, and concluding them all in unbelief, is, under his wise and good Providence, instrumental in the final introduction of all, both Jews and Gentiles, to holiness and happiness.

(*To be concluded in No. 50.*)

From the Philadelphia Reformer.

MODERN MISSIONARIES.

(*Continued.*)

In remarking upon one of the missionaries from India, who has now been for some time in this country, he states:

'The first piece of policy with him and his Board, was to enlist all the Baptist associations in the United States, upwards of a hundred, as they since boast. Their means for so doing was a circular published, a copy of which was sent by the trusty hand of the agent himself, or some understrapper of his; but much better delivered when executed by himself. The purport of this circular letter was, among other fine tales, craving a correspondence with all the associations. Surely no objecting voice was heard to the correspondence. All seemed hearty in exchange of compliments with these great people, while the meekness of the lamb, and the harmlessness of the dove, appeared in —— himself with his bows and scrapes. But it was not hard to see, that he was a man of great subtlety. With the circular, was sent by the Board, their first report on missionary matters, a pamphlet of near sixty pages, all of which was chiefly dictated by himself. With all the above named lumber, in the year 1815, Mr. —— made his first appearance in Kentucky, at Elkhorn association, near Lexington. He got to the place on Saturday evening after meeting had adjourned, and though a year before the association had decided that there should be no collection made on the Lord's day, a few leading men encouraged Mr. ——, in the prime part of the day, to preach a missionary sermon, and make a collection. When he rose up, the assembly of thousands seemed stricken with his appearance. A tall, pale looking, well dressed young man, with all the solemn appearance of one who was engaged in the work of the Lord, and perhaps he thought he was. He also being a stranger, every eye and ear was open; his text was '*Thy kingdom come.*' He spoke some handsome things about the kingdom of Christ; but every stroke he gave seemed to mean MONEY. For my own part, I was more amused with his ingenuity, than edified by his discourse; and more astonished at his art in the close, than at any other time. He had the more pathos the nearer he came getting the money, and raising his arms as if he had some awfully pleasing vision, expressed, without a hesitating doubt, that the angels were hovering over the assembly, and participating in our heavenly exertions, and just ready to take their leave, and bear the good tidings to heaven of what we were then about, in giving our money for the instruction and conversion of the poor Heathen; and as if he had power to stop Gabriel's flight, in the most pathetic strain cried, Stop angels! till you have witnessed the generosity of this assembly. About this time, perhaps twenty men, previously appointed, moved through the assembly with their hats, and near $200 were collected.—Though I admired the art of this well-taught Yankee, yet I considered him a modern Tetzel, and that the Pope's old orator of that name was equally innocent with Mr. ——, and his motive about the same.

'Meek and lamb-like as Mr. —— first appeared at Elkhorn Association, a few years after he made a very different appearance at Dover Association, in Virginia; for being expected at a meeting on Sunday, he with others had been elected to preach on that day. He did not arrive until about the time worship began. After being invited to the stage, he took his seat by Mr. Semple, who privately informed him of the previous day's selection of himself to preach. After asking if Mr. Semple had appointed men to make a collection after he was done preaching, and being answered in the negative, he positively averred if he did not do it, he would not preach. Perhaps, says Mr. Semple, you mean you will not preach us a *Missionary sermon*, if I do not appoint them. He replied, I will not preach at all, if you do not have the men ready for that purpose. Rather than quarrel with that gentleman on the stage, Mr. Semple appointed the men, and himself one of them, and about ten others of the oldest and most respectable ministers (of that great body of more than forty churches) bore their own hats through the congregation, making the collection, to please his lordship. But all this was several years after Mr. —— had been collecting thousands upon thousands, and his fame was very great.

'For my own part I have never seen one of those missionaries, but which, like Daniel's little horn, was more stout than his fellows. Chap. vii. 8, and 20. Whatever their preaching talents may be, they seem more stout than other preachers—STOUT in their own esteem; and though some of them have very moderate preaching capacities, they seem stout—the approbation of the great board has made them stout, more stout than their fellows. Indeed, my own opinion is, from my acquaintance with some of those renowned men, that the board itself is either weak in judgment about gospel ministers, or unfaithful in the choice of their men; for it seems not so much the question, what is your character or preaching talents, as who will go for, us—answer our purpose to hoodwink the people, and get plenty of money?

'The very many modes, and artful measures of those great men to get money, are disgustful to common modesty. They begin with missionary societies; then they create a great board of different officers, and then select the most vigorous and artful agent they can find, to create more societies of different grades, as female societies, cent societies, mite societies, children societies, and even negro societies, both free and bond. Every missionary to a foreign country, is authorized to follow all these arts, as well as common begging, to get money; so that no set of men ever yet seen on the earth, manifest a greater thirst by these various modes to get money. How very different are the characters of these men from the ancient missionaries of the cross of Christ; for they went forth, taking nothing from the Gentiles—and all for the name's sake of Jesus Christ. These men grasp all they can, from saints and sinners. The apostle John exhorts Gaius to receive such godly ministers, who preached without pay. By the same parity, all preachers who will not preach but for money, should be rejected by all the Christian world—and held in contempt by all mankind. Paul coveted no man's silver or gold, or apparel. How unlike these men? whose hands are always stretched out for money, and like the horse-leech, ever crying, *give, give!!!* Paul was determined not to be chargeable to any; and glories in preaching the gospel without charge—Yea, he had rather die, than do otherwise.—But it seems as if these men would die if they did not get plenty of money. What a striking contrast! And what but modern missionary brass, could ever induce these men to such shameful presumption?

'Perhaps I might not use the freedom I do, but for two tours I have taken in the Missouri country within a year past. The marvellous tales, coming from that country, about the mission there, were some inducement to my enterprise. To read, or hear the reports of —— and ——,* it would seem as if the whole country was almost a blank as to religion. But the fact of the case contradicts their reports. From their statements, one would think, there was not surely a preacher in the country that deserved the name, and hardly a church there that was in good order; whereas the fact is, there are three Baptist associations in the territory, and as many preachers, perhaps, as there are in Kentucky, according to the number of the people, and many of them respectable.—But it is probable these men think, that but few deserve the name of preachers, but missionaries.

'There is a great boast of what they have done in St. Louis, in building a spacious meeting-house, the dimensions of which, I do not precisely recollect. I suppose it would hold a thousand people; underneath the whole is a story of stone for the purpose of storage, and adjoining the building is a house in the form of an L, two stories high, as a dwelling house for the missionaries. It is said five thousand dollars have been appropriated, and the house only covered in. It is thought three or four thousand more will finish it. The means used to procure money, so far as they have gone, would put any man to the blush but a missionary; and the reader will be the more surprised when he is told, that the greatest number that attends to hear these men preach is about one hundred. This I was an eyewitness to. But it seems the ambition of these men was to vie with the Catholics, who have lately built a large brick church.

'What a mighty noise is made in missionary writings, about the sufferings and privations of their missionaries, sent to distant countries! But I consider the chief of it to be pharisaical boast. As to privations in the Missouri, our brethren there apprehend that they have monopolized the whole country, so far as Baptist society goes; and are living in style, in the flourishing towns of St. Louis and St. Charles, without any very great appearance of self-denial, or abstemious living, or any other anxieties or trouble, than are seen in other gay gentlemen, except disappointment in not getting as much money as answers their extensive views. Their cravings are great.

'How very little likeness there is between these high-minded men, and the ancient missionaries, if we take Paul for one of them. From his own account, as also the witness of the Holy Ghost, in every city he entered, bonds and afflictions attended him. Wherever these men go, if they are not honoured more than other preachers, they highly resent it.—I could give instances, but I forbear. Though all the world can see they suffer but little, yet what a racket is made among them, about their great privations!

(*To be concluded next week.*)

* Two missionaries of the same society with Mr. Taylor.

Communications.

To the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

SIR—Having long been in the habit of attentively reading the Gospel Herald, and having, according to my ability, treasured what I considered to be truth, and rejected the falsities contained in it, I have to beg your indulgence while I briefly and humbly state some of my objections both to your correspondents and yourself; and I hope you will kindly set me right where I may be wrong.

I have been taught to consider the Deity as infinitely happy and glorious, in and of himself, and consequently can stand in need of nothing we can do to add to his happiness and *essential* glory; nevertheless, owing to his infinite benignity and boundless love, we are led to believe that the salvation of a sinner affords pleasure even to Omnipotence; and that it conduces to increase his *declarative* glory, and to commend his love to a fallen world. If, therefore, the salvation of *one* individual be pleasant to the Deity, by parity of reason, the salvation of *thousands* must enhance the pleasure, and that of a *world* must infinitely increase it.

I have been led to this conclusion by the manner in which some of your correspondents endeavour to *evade* your arguments in favour of the universal love of God to man. Some of them, indeed, will needs question the *possibility*, and even the *utility* of it, who yet, I presume, would not willingly be left out of the bundle of life. God, in his word, is emphatically styled *Love*; (thus, GOD IS LOVE) and I cannot, for the life of me, reconcile the idea of love with the damnation of the object of it. For example; 'God *so loved the world*, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' The same book solemnly assures us, that 'It is impossible for God to lie;' how, therefore, I ask, dare some of your correspondents assert the contrary, and with much seeming gravity assure you and your readers, that God is not loving to every man; but that he is so whimsically partial to some (to wit: the *chief of sinners*) that it is quite impossible for them to miss the *strait* gate and *narrow* way; while he so inveterately *hates* the rest, that though they may strive with all their might to find, and keep in this way, they *shall* lose it, and be finally damned for not doing what God determined they should not do; that is, in plain English, *for doing his will!!!*

A popular writer* assures us, that 'unfeigned love to God will infallibly be accompanied with universal love to our fellow-creatures.' That 'we cannot converse with any man; we cannot receive a kindness from any man; nay, we cannot receive an injury from any man, for whom the Redeemer has not died! And that all human considerations put together cannot so powerfully inspire us with an indifference to the vanities of life, and the allurements of unhallowed pleasures, as a devout belief in this.' I will now turn to yourself.

Although, in the main, I cordially like your productions, there are some things in which I cannot agree with you. You decry works, as conditions to our salvation. Now I will ingenuously assure you, that I depend on the mercy of God, through the merits of Christ, for salvation, as entirely as you can do; yet I suppose that Almighty grace, so far from setting aside diligent exertion, is the principle which promotes it. I have often been struck with the following declarations, and I humbly offer them to your earnest consideration. 'The kingdom of heaven suffereth *violence*'—'*Strive* to enter in at the strait gate'—'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, *do it with thy might*'—'*Work* out your own salvation'—'*Take up the cross*, and *follow* me'—'If thine eye offend thee, *pluck it out*'—and a multitude of others and similar texts, plainly indicating conditions in our salvation. To this labour, this watchfulness, this sedulity of endeavour; in short, *on these conditions*, the crown of life is expressly promised; and salvation is not less the free gift of God, because he has affixed certain conditions to our obtaining it.

The Christian life, I humbly think, is not a point, but a progress. It is very similar in the race of Christianity as in the race of human glory. Julius Cæsar and St. Paul describe their respective warfares in nearly the same terms. 'We should count nothing done while any thing remains undone,† says the warrior. 'Not counting myself to have attained—forgetting the things which are behind, and *pressing* forward to those which are before,' says the apostle. And it is worthy of remark, that they both made the disqualifying observation after attainments almost incredible. The necessity of pursuit is the same in both cases, though the objects pursued differ as widely as the vanities of time and the riches of eternity.

I am not conscious of any thing disrespectful in the foregoing observations; but should you, Sir, discover any such, you are at perfect liberty to use the pruning-knife; curtail as much as you please, only retain the sense, if there be any, and you will always please

Your humble Servant,
GIDEON.

Note. The declarations offered by Gideon for our serious consideration, shall be seasonably noticed.

* Hannah More.

† Nil actum reputans dum quod superesset agendum.
LUCAN.

Controversial.

For the Gospel Herald.

That the Universalists' scheme of salvation is '*consonant with the goodness and mercy of God*, and yet *utterly inconsistent with the character of man*,' is a position which I am not disposed to yield; notwithstanding it is supposed to be a concession of premisses, which leads to the unavoidable conclusion of the doctrine of *Unconditional* salvation.

It is no doubt difficult for an *Universalist* to see how it is, that God *wills* and *desires* the salvation of *all men*, and yet that he can save *none* without their own consent and co-operation. This results, not from any difficulty in the thing itself, but from that particular view of the subject which leads an Universalist to look at *one side* only of the picture, without sufficiently regarding the other. That view is, if I understand it, that as God *wills* and *desires* the salvation of all, and as he is *Omnipotent*, and will certainly effect his purpose, so he will of consequence save the whole human race. Now this I say, is viewing only one side of the picture. For if God is *Omnipotent*, man, on the other hand, is a *voluntary agent;* and *Omnipotence itself* cannot change the nature of a *voluntary agent*, against his consent, without violating the *freedom* of his actions. Unless then it can be shown, that man is not a *voluntary agent*, and has not the *power of choosing* and *refusing*, we have no reason to believe, that God exerts his Omnipotence to change men, from evil to good, against their consent. If he does, why not change them *here* as well as *hereafter*.

By *agent*, I mean a being, not who acts *for another*, but for himself. By a *voluntary agent*, one who acts *freely* from his own *volitions*. The term agent is from a Latin word, (agree, to act,) and does not mean a substitute, but one who acts (of himself.) Man acts from *volition*, that is, from the principle of his *will*. An evil man acts from a depraved and *evil* will; a good man from *good* desires and affections. The one is in a state of *sin*, or a *sinner;* the other in a state of *regeneration*, or in a state of *good*. Let it be understood that I speak of men, in their *unregenerate* and in their *regenerate* state. It is the purpose of God to change them from this state, to a state of *regeneration*. But if this change was effected by the mere exertion of the Divine Omnipotence, it is plain, that man's *freedom*, that is, the power of *willing* and *acting* freely, would be *forced*, and of course *destroyed*. This would destroy the very nature of man, for that nature is, the power of willing and of acting *of himself*. Not that he is independent of God. God continually gives him the *power* both to *will* and *to do*. But he wills and does *as of himself*, by the power which he derives from God.

It is true, the change spoken of above, is from God, but then in the production of this change, God has continually regard to man's rationality and freedom. To effect this change without impairing these, is the purpose of God in regeneration, and when this cannot be done, the man cannot be regenerated.

The progress of regeneration is twofold. A change wrought, first in the *understanding*, and secondly in the *will*. We know that man by nature (as the phrase is) is, with regard to spiritual things, in darkness and in error. To bring him out of darkness and error, is to bring him into the light of truth; and this is a change wrought in the understanding. We know also that man, by nature, is in love of evil, his propensities and desires all tend towards evil, or, they tend towards the indulgence of his passions. To bring him out of this state, is to bring him into the love of good, and into a state, in which he has dominion over his natural lusts and inclinations; and this is the change wrought in the *will*. Now, all experience shows (and this is better than ten thousand arguments) that men cannot be compelled to *understand truth*, or be forced to *love good*. Of course they cannot be changed, as to their understandings and wills, and of course cannot be regenerated, without their *consent or co-operation*.

What this consent or co-operation is, is plainly declared in the Scriptures; 'Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings, *cease* to do evil, *learn* to do well.' That man has the ability, derived from God, to do this, is plain from the very circumstance that he is commanded to do it. For it would be idle to suppose, that he would be commanded to do, what he had not power to do. It is plain also from experience, man, if he pleases, can think good thoughts; he can refrain from doing evil; and by this means he can learn to do well. This is what *he* has to do. When man does his part, God will not fail to do his. This is the condition. And thus he works out his own salvation, and yet acknowledges that it is God that worketh in him, both to will and to do.

Where then is the merit which is said to be claimed by the creature on this ground? Can he claim merit for doing that, which he continually derives the power to do from God. If it was on the score of merit that man was saved, by doing the will of his heavenly Father, I certainly would not contend for conditions. This is not the case. All I contend for, is, that what man does, is for the purpose of inducing on himself *a state* wherein the Divine can operate in communicating to his soul, the blessings of eternal and everlasting life.

It is admitted that God *desires* to do this to *all*. But it is contended, and we trust has been shown, that he *cannot* do this to any, except to those, who by previous acts of preparation on *their* part, have put *themselves* in a state of recipiency, by concurring with the Divine operation.

J. C.

P. S. As Universalists are not agreed among themselves, on many points of doctrine, aside from the principal one of Universal restoration, J. C. cannot undertake for the opinions of individuals.

REMARKS.

We think J. C. has made a mistake in his *first* paragraph, for we cannot see any obstacle in the way to '*yielding* a position,' after '*confessing* its truth.

J. C. in his *second* paragraph, expresses an opinion that 'Universalists only look at *one* side of the picture, &c.; at all events we will *now* look at the *other* side. Here it is—'For *if* God is *Omnipotent*, man, on the other hand, is a *voluntary agent;* and Omnipotence, itself, *cannot* change the *nature* of a *voluntary* agent, against *his* consent, without violating the *freedom* of his actions,' &c. Quere. How does it follow, that God *cannot* be *Omnipotent*, without man is a *voluntary agent?* Does the *Almighty* power of God depend on the *power* of *man?* Suppose J. C. was to say, that *A* could not have *all* the money in New-York, except *B, C, and D*, to the last letter in the alphabet, each had a *part*, who would believe him? And where would be the difference in the two positions? Suppose J.C. were *voluntarily* to leave New-York in a ship for London, and God by his Omnipotent power caused a storm to overwhelm the ship and J. C. in the ocean, 'against *his consent?*' would it follow, that God was *not* Omnipotent? or that J. C. was not a *voluntary* agent? or, would it effect a change in J. C.'s *nature?* Would not such an event *violate* the *freedom* of J. C's *actions?* and instead of leaving J. C. *free* to go to London, send him against his *will* to the bottom of the ocean? Would it *change* his nature from that of a *voluntary* agent, to an *involuntary* man, and prove that he could *not*, if he would *choose* to go to London, go there; and that he *must* go into the ocean, *refuse* or not? We think the 'voluntary agent' in this case, would stand a poor chance! And that all that could be said about the '*freedom* of his actions,' would be summed up in the declaration, that he was deprived of the *power* to *act* at all!

J. C. continues—'Unless then it can be shown, that man is *not* a voluntary agent, and has not the *power* of choosing and refusing, we have *no reason* to believe that God exerts his Omnipotence to change men *from* evil *to* good *against* their consent.' Now, if we can prove that God ever exerts his Omnipotence to change men, and make them better, J. C. to be consistent with his *own* premises, must give up his *free agency!* This we can abundantly prove. Jer. xiii. 23. 'Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? *then* may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil.' John vi. 44. 'No man *can* come to me, *except* the Father which hath sent me *draw* him.' These prove the inability of man. Here is the negative. Now for the affirmative—Heb. viii. 10, 11, 12. '*I will* put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I *will* be to them a God, and they *shall* be to me a people. And they shall *not* teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; *for all shall know* me, from the least to the greatest. (Quere. Will not missionaries then be useless?) For I *will* be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.' We think these passages conclusive. And we likewise think, that this, from the Hebrews, is not always understood; and, although it would be a very good reason that might be assigned why a *man* should not teach his neighbour, that very few men know *themselves*, still, we think the apostle in his quotation from the prophet, assigns a *better;* namely, that 'God *will* put (not man) his laws in their mind, and write them in their hearts, and he *will* be to them a *God*, and they *shall* be *to* him a *people!*' Here is no *condition*, or *limitation*.

J. C. in his *third* paragraph, defines the word *agent* to mean 'one who acts *freely* from his *own* volitions;' and afterwards says, 'Not that he is *independent* of God. God continually *gives* him the *power*, both to *will* and to *do*. But he *wills* and does as *of himself*, by the power which he *derives* from *God!!!* And this reader, is *free-agency!* Where does the man get his *will* and the *power* to use it? J. C. says 'from God;' for he is not independent *of* God; but still, he is a *free-agent!* Now suppose a case—but remember, that the apostle speaking of all men, says, they 'were made *subject* to vanity,' &c.;—A man is in prison; his keeper *gives* him food, and *gives* him the *will* to *eat* it—but the man is *free*, and his keeper would *destroy* his freedom, were he to employ *his power* to influence the man, &c.; consequently, it is not of *his power* that he gives the *food* and the *will* to eat that food! We think J. C.'s premises are contradictory; for to suppose an Omnipotent Being to purpose and intend a thing, and a finite impotent being to *oppose* that purpose effectually, is of all suppositions the most unreasonable. 'It is not in *man* who walketh, to *direct* his steps.' And if all men are dependent on *God*, for every thing which can be considered *good*, their *agency*, call it *free*, or what you will, can never subvert, or alter, the design or purposes of the Almighty. It is absurd to say that God is *all mighty*, and then pretend there is *might* besides *his* might, and which will effectually prevent his designs from being accomplished. Of the use J. C. makes of the word *regeneration*, we remark, that man has no *agency*, in the sense J. C. implies, in this *regeneration;* and we think our correspondents are bound, either to refrain from thus using or applying this term, or to controvert *our* definition *of* the term! And we cannot refrain from asking our friends who are so fond of free-agency, and who contend so stoutly that God *cannot* change man without his *consent*, How it happened that God created man *without* his (the man's) consent? Did God bring man *into* being of his *own* accord, and after man receives his being, will God consult with man, and leave it with man to decide, whether his (the Maker's) intention should be accomplished? The Scriptures declare of men, that they are 'all gone out of the way, there is none that understandeth, no, not *one!*' Will a Being *Infinite* in Wisdom, submit to have his purposes frustrated by *fools*, who have *no understanding?* And is it not preposterous to the last extreme, to imagine an Almighty, All-wise Being, consulting the inclinations or free-choice of a being, who is '*blind*,' and destitute of *understanding;* and who invariably chooses death rather than life? Now J. C.'s position, that all men are *evil* until *regenerated*, and act from *depraved wills*, involves the absurdity, that, if man has a part in, actually consents to his regeneration, *before* he is *regenerated*, he acts from an *evil* will, and his choice is the effect of his *depravity!* We are speaking of

J. C.'s regeneration; the *Scripture* regeneration is different altogether! Our readers will please to notice, that J. C. defines a *free-agent* to be one who 'acts freely from *his own* volitions.' Now, if this definition is correct, no man is a *free-agent* who is under any *obligation* to act according to the volitions or will of *another!* And we have no hesitation in saying, that this can never be controverted!

Of J. C.'s *fourth* paragraph, we remark, that it is declaration without proof; and the positions there assumed, can never be supported by the Scriptures. The reader is requested to examine it carefully.—What does J. C. mean by '*man's rationality*?' Is it his *want* of understanding, and his disposition to do wrong? J. C. has settled the question, that 'man by *nature* (in what he calls an unregenerate state) is in the love of *evil*, his propensities and desires *all* tend towards *evil*.' Are these '*evil* desires and propensities, and love of *evil*,' &c., the 'rationality' that God has a 'continual regard to?' If not, what is it? And what else can there be, when 'his propensities and desires *all* tend towards *evil*?' Is God so fond of these '*evil* propensities and desires,' that he invariably avoids every thing in his conduct towards man, which would '*impair*' them?

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

For the Gospel Herald.

To J. C.—Jeremiah xxxi. 15. is in the letter as follows: "Thus saith the Lord—'A voice *was* heard in Ramah,—lamentation—bitter weeping;—Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not.' 16th verse. Thus saith the Lord—'Refrain thy voice from weeping and thy eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord: and *they* shall come again from the land of the enemy. verse 17. And there is hope in the end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come *again* to their own border."

The letter of this prophecy of Jerem. evidently respects the captivity of the Jews at Babylon. Rachel weeps, during this 70 years of desolation for her captive children, because they were not in Ramah. The Lord comforts Rachel, and tells her, that '*they* shall come again from the land of the enemy—to their own border.'

By Matthew chap. ii. we are told that this has another fulfilment; or that these things were spoken of the slaughter of all the children of Bethlehem by the barbarous Herod. If Matthew is correct in this explanation, as we suppose he is, what are we to understand by the children coming *again*, from the land of the enemy—to their own border?

I doubt not but this can be explained spiritually as well as literally—and it would be a satisfaction to several inquirers after the true understanding of these texts, which are not rightly comprehended unless they are spiritually understood. For the Scriptures are to be interpreted spiritually: and the words that *Christ* and God *spoke*, and still *speak*, are spirit and *life*; and should be spiritually and livingly apprehended.

PHILO-LOGOS.

Note by the Editor. The declaration of Philo-Logos is recommended to the attention of all. 'The words that *Christ* and God *spoke*, and still speaks, are spirit and *life*; and should be spiritually and *livingly* apprehended!' Consequently, whoever speaks of *endless death and misery* is not of God! Neither are they '*livingly*' apprehended, when they are construed to mean endless destruction and *death* to the souls of men!

PREMIUM OFFERED.

The premium of '*well done*,' &c., will be given to any Calvinist, who will tell what chapter and verse contains the declaration that Christ did *not die* for the *non-elect*; or that he died for the *elect*; or that he died for a *part* of mankind; or that he did *not* die for the *whole world!!!* And the same premium will be given to any Arminian, who will tell what chapter and verse contains the declaration, that any for whom Christ died, will be *endlessly miserable*; or that the salvation of the *soul* in a *future* state depends in *part*, or in the *whole*, on the *works* of the creature!!!

And this premium will be awarded to any Calvinist, who will give an exposition of Romans viii. 20—23; xi. 7—12, without *contradicting* himself *twenty* times!!! And the same to any Arminian, who will give an exposition of Romans iii. 19—24. and Ephes. ii. 4—9, without *contradicting* himself *ten* times!!!

HARMONY OF TRUTH.

Isaiah xxxix. 6—8. 'The voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh *is* grass, and all the goodliness thereof as the flower of the field. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the Spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it: Surely the *people is grass*. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever.' What is 'the *word* of our God?' (See 9th, 10th and 11th verses) Ephes. i. 13. 'The *word* of truth—*the gospel of your salvation*.' Romans x. 9. 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.' Phil. ii. 10, 11. 'That at the name of Jesus *every knee* should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; and that *every tongue* should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' Isaiah xlv. 23, 24. 'I have *sworn* by myself, the word *is* gone out of my mouth, righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me *every* knee shall bow, *every* tongue shall swear, surely shall say, In the LORD *have I righteousness* and strength; to him shall come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed.' See lv. 8—13. Romans iii. 20—24. 1 John v. 9—11. Rev. v. 13.

'*Watchman, What of the Night?*'

Jer. v. 30, 31. 'A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land; the *prophets* prophecy *falsely*, and the priests *bear rule* by their means; and my people *love to have it so*.' This is perfectly applicable in these times. Are there not *false prophets* now? And cannot they be identified? Here is the touchstone; apply it! Acts iii. 20, 21. 'And he shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive until the *times of restitution of all* things, which *God* hath spoken by the mouth of *all his holy prophets* since the world began.' In the words of John, 'Beloved, believe not *every* spirit, but *try* the spirits whether they are *of God*; because many *false prophets* are gone out into the world.' How many of the popular 'spirits' of our time, whose eyes are single to the '*loaves and fishes*,' would stand this test? Who, and where are they, who speak of the '*times of restitution of all things?*' Who, and where are *they*, who speak *against*, and deny the '*times of restitution of all things?*' Let these questions be answered without any *mental* reservation, or *equivocation* whatever! Let the prophets of Baal call upon their god, (produce their evidences from Calvin, Hopkins, &c.) and the prophets who 'testify of the *restitution of all* things,' call upon their God, and from his revelation in the Scriptures they can confound their opposers; 'five would *chase* an hundred, and an hundred would put ten thousand to *flight!*

From the London Universalist's Miscellany.

RULE FOR UNDERSTANDING THE WORD, ALL, IN SCRIPTURE.

It is well known that the word *all*, as it occurs in the Scriptures, admits of various acceptations. Sometimes it means literally and mathematically, *the whole*, without any exception; at other times only a *part*, and sometimes only a *small part*. These different uses of it have contributed much to support the controversy, which has long existed concerning the extent of the death of Christ, and Christians on both sides, have argued with apparent force, alternately insisting on the *restricted* or *unlimited* sense of the word. Could a certain rule be found in the Scriptures themselves, to determine always how we are to understand it, much dispute would be avoided, and the controversy relative to the extent of the death of Christ would be settled; and by the same rule, the doctrine of the *Restoration* might be proved to be true or false. It is reasonable to suppose that the Scriptures do afford sufficient ground for such a rule: for it is contended that the Bible is a *plain* book, and easy to be understood, *in all its doctrines and precepts*, by every honest and diligent reader of it. Let the following rule therefore be kept in view, viz. That whenever we meet with the word *all*, in connexion with any point of *doctrine*, it always means *literally* and *mathematically* the *whole*, including all its parts; but where it is used *historically*, it frequently admits of *hyperbole*. This use of the word is consistent with common sense and common usage. If any man can find a *single* exception to this rule in the whole Bible, he is invited to make it known. To illustrate this rule, consider Heb. ii. 8. *For in that he put* all *in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him.* And also 1 Cor. xv. 27. *For he hath put* all *things under his feet. But when he saith* all *things are put under him, it is manifest that he*, only, *is excepted which did put all things under him.* In these passages the Apostle gives instances of the word being taken in its fullest latitude, when connected with *doctrines*. When we meet with it in relation to the death of Christ for *men*, the same extensive sense of the word is necessarily understood, as Isa. liii. 6. *The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us* all. The prophet had been saying, All *we like sheep have gone astray: we have turned every one to his own way.* It is evident that he here describes the whole human race; for we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God; so that he asserts, that all who have gone astray, have had their iniquities laid upon Christ. This can never be disproved, unless it can be showed that some men have not sinned; which would be an express contradiction both to Scripture and experience.

In historical passages it is different, as in Matt. iii. 5, 6. *Then went out to him Jerusalem, and* all *Judea, and* all *the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan.* Here we must understand only a part of Jerusalem, &c. For we are elsewhere told, that the Scribes and Pharisees rejected John's baptism.

But we are nowhere told of any for whom Christ did *not* die; nor any where told of any who are *not* given to him, &c. It is presumed, therefore, that the above rule is strictly true, and if kept in view, in reading the Scriptures, will be of great service to serious inquirers after truth.

A puzzling Question to a Universalist.

I was conversing about two years ago, with Dr. R———. Our subject was the Universal Restoration; I maintained the affirmative, the good Doctor the negative. At last, 'Brother Vidler,' says the Doctor, 'let me ask you a simple question.' 'Yes, Brother R———,' if you please, quoth I. 'I ask then,' continued he, 'that though *you* think God is so merciful, that he never *will* damn any sinner, *endlessly*; yet, when you view *yourself* as a sinner, don't you think, that you *deserve* endless damnation?' I answered, 'When you, Doctor, can prove, that God *has threatened* sinners with *endless* damnation; I will then own that I *deserve endless* damnation. Because, it is a maxim with me, that God is as just in his *threatenings*, as in the *execution* of them.' The Doctor did not attempt to prove that there was any *such* threat in Scripture. *ibid.*

'*Strictures on the Doctrine of Universal Salvation,*' &c.

*** A work bearing the above title, in which it is attempted to 'prove the doctrine to be incompatible with the *promises*, *threatenings*, *invitations*, and most *solemn* asseverations of the moral Governor of the Universe,' was *yesterday* ushered before the public, fresh from the press, by the Rev. S. Crowell:—And an *answer* to it will be printed on Wednesday next. They will be sold by the Carrier of the G.H.

*** Timotheus is received—but his phraseology is objectionable. His name, or his assistance in altering his communication, is indispensable.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1821. NO. 49

Communications.

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR.—You will oblige a friend to truth by inserting in your Herald the following Dialogue, which actually transpired in the month of February last, in the city of Hudson, (N. Y.) where, at the present day, there is a great 'Religious stir' among a zealous class of Calvinists. I was an eye-witness to the fact. It occurred at a *Conference Meeting*, where such scenes were exhibited as surpass description:—Crying, groaning, reeling to and fro, and twisting about, apparently in much misery; making use of their pocket handkerchiefs very frequently as mementos of their intense convictions of sin; and apparently condemning themselves to a kind of *hell*, in their own bodies! Some, however, I particularly noticed, were whispering to each other, and laughing; while two other young apostles were busily engaged with the *hair*, not to say with the *bonnets*, of the young convert ladies: however, eventually, they, with a soft whisper, inquired into *the state of their minds*.

The Dialogue between the Rev. Mr. S. (a Calvinist) *and the Rev. Mr. T.* (a Universalist.)

S. Are you an inquirer after truth?

T. I am, Sir.

S. What is your name?

T. T———, Sir.

S. How long is it since you have become anxious?

T. Ever since I have arrived to the years of discretion, to exercise reason and a proper judgment.

S. (With heavy belchings) Well, don't you believe, that should you die to-night, in your present situation, you would go *immediately to hell?*

T. Before I answer that question directly or indirectly, I wish you to explain, to my satisfaction, what you mean by *the truth?*

S. Don't you believe the Bible to be the truth?

T. I believe, Sir, the Sacred Scriptures *contain the truth.*

S. What truth?

T. That "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son"—"That God, who cannot lie, hath *promised* us eternal life;" if I believe not this, I make God a liar, and the truth is not in me. Therefore, with St. Paul, "I say, the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot diarnnul, that it should make the promise of none effect."

S. Are you a preacher, or public speaker?

T. I may possibly, Sir, be so considered by the public.

S. To what denomination do you belong? Are you acquainted with Mr. P.?

T. I am, Sir.

S. Do you preach the Universal doctrine?

T. I do, Sir.

S. Do you believe that doctrine?

T. I do, Sir, or I certainly should not preach it.

S. Why do you come *here* to inquire after truth?

T. That I may increase in knowledge. Permit me, Sir, to inquire, for what purpose did the Deity bring us into existence? what were the designs of God in our creation? and the end of our being?

S. I do not wish to enter into an argument with you. I presume you have doubts and fears respecting your doctrine. I think your conscience must smite you.

T. I have neither *doubts nor fears* with regard to the doctrine of the final restitution of all things. I have, Sir, formerly been a very zealous person among the Calvinists, and am still a member of a church of that order, (legally so,) and in perfect accordance with the views which I entertain of your doctrines; I believe those, and those only, who build their hopes upon the foundation of an imaginary hell in another world, are the very persons who suffer the tormenting effects of this enthusiasm, as well as the pangs of an agonizing mind, with *doubts and fears.*

S. You are a wicked person. Yours is a very wicked and licentious doctrine: you are foolish for believing it: you are going to *hell*, and leading thousands of souls to hell with you. I know the disposition of the Universalists well: they are *obstinate* and *wilful*: their doctrine is heresy; and you are in an error.

T. Sir, that is saying much. I wish you to prove to me the heresy of the doctrine. If I am in an error, please to set me right: my mind is open, and free for conviction: I am willing to receive advice and instruction from any man. If you will satisfactorily prove to me, by scriptural testimony, that there will be punishment in a future state; and that it will be endless; I *then* will, but not until then, acknowledge the doctrine of endless torments.

S. I do not wish to enter into a controversy with you, Sir.

T. Will you be so good as to reply to the statement just made?

S. I am not in the habit of instructing *ministers of the gospel.* I will leave you, Sir.

The above is a true statement of facts. From the knowledge, Mr. Editor, which I have of these bigoted enthusiasts, they are stealing, or in other words, insinuating themselves into the young and tender mind, dragging it into concessions of unwarrantable doctrines, by flattery and force. Perhaps no age of the world has been so marked as a time of inquiry after truth as the present. This, undoubtedly, is one cause why these *hot* Calvinists fear; they have reason to fear; for there is a dreadful shaking among the dry bones; their diabolical system trembles to its very centre. May the Divine approbation accompany and smile upon the exertions made for the promulgation of the gospel of Christ, and hasten the happy period, when *truth* shall finally triumph over error, and when "none shall make afraid nor destroy in all God's holy mountain."

JUNIUS.

For the Gospel Herald.

BISHOP NEWTON'S COMMENTS, &c.

Bishop Newton, in his Dissertations on the Prophecies, 8th edit. vol. ii. p. 384. commenting on Dan. xii. 2. expresses himself thus:—"Such expressions can with truth and propriety be applied only to the general resurrection of the just and unjust: and though it be said, "*Many* of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," yet that is no objection to the truth here delivered; for, as Theodoret observed long ago, the prophet hath said *many* for *all*, in the same manner as St. Paul hath put *many* for *all*, when he said, 'If through the offence of one, *many* be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto *many*.' Rom. v. 15. And again, ver. 19. "As by one man's disobedience *many* were many sinners, so by the obedience of one shall *many* be made righteous.'" Now, Reader, I appeal to your good sense, what does the above language of Bishop Newton amount to, but downright Universalism? Lay aside your prejudice, and examine it once more, with an eye of candour, and see if we differ in our opinion. And as the Bishop said, "St. Paul hath put *many* for *all*," please to leave out the word *many*, and substitute the word *all*, and see what it will amount to. Why, Reader, as sure as that you have a Christian name, it will amount to *Universalism*, in plain English. Let us read it; ver. 15. "If through the offence of one *all* be *dead*, much more the grace of God, and the *gift* by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto *all*." Ver. 19. "As by one man's disobedience *all* were made *sinners*, so by the obedience of one shall *all* be made *righteous*." What, Reader, shall ALL be made righteous? Yes; Bishop Newton confesses it. Will any of those who are made righteous be given to the devil, to be *roasted* without mercy? You dare not say it: for David saith, Ps. xxxiv. 17. "The Righteous cry, and the Lord heareth and delivereth them out of all their troubles." And again, ver. 19. he says, "Many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth him out of them all." But, reader, although Bishop Newton acknowledges that all shall be made righteous, yet you may still doubt it, and persist in your unbelief. Well, then, I will introduce testimony which you dare not doubt: It is the oath of Almighty God, and is found in the forty-fifth chapter of Isaiah. It reads thus: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall say, In the Lord have I *righteousness* and strength," &c. Well, then, if every knee and every tongue shall have righteousness, then surely every knee and every tongue will be righteous; for "No corrupt tree can bring forth good fruit." Reader, how long will you fly in the face of Omnipotence, and, by your unbelief, give God the lie? How long yield your credence to the abominable system of Calvin? Let us examine his system. What does Calvinism amount to? It amounts to the following:

The eternal God of *love* and *mercy*, ere he made man, *decreed*, with Infinite *hatred* and *cruelty*, that the non-elect (comprising innumerable millions then and yet unborn) should be eternally afflicted, with inexpressible agony, for performing those very actions, which he, by his Infinite power, foreordained they *should* perform.

Proof, from the Assembly's Catechism.

Question.—What are the decrees of God?

Answer.—The decrees of God are his eternal purpose, according to the counsel of his will, whereby, for his own glory, he has *foreordained whatsoever comes to pass.*

Quere.—Did not the death of Michael Servetus *come to pass* by the means of your founder, John Calvin? and will God afflict him to all eternity for doing that which he, by his Infinite power, had decreed he should do? Answer, ye men of wisdom.

S.

Controversial.

For the Gospel Herald.

NOTE TO THE READER.

In the fourth line of the third paragraph of J. C.'s last communication, the reader is requested to correct the following typographical error. For *agree*, to act, read *agere*, to act.

J. C. is unwilling to charge the Editor with wilfully misrepresenting his meaning, but he *has* misrepresented it in so *many instances* in the course of his correspondence, that he thinks he has just cause of complaint.

The Editor does not seem to know the difference between *not yielding* a position, and *confessing* its truth. For once he may be the wiser for looking into his dictionary. He had asserted that J. C.'s position, 'that the Universalists scheme of salvation is consonant with the mercy and goodness of God, and yet utterly inconsistent with the character of man' lead to a conclusion opposite to what J. C. intended. J. C. says, that he is not disposed to *yield*

(give up) this position, notwithstanding this supposed consequence, and then goes on to enlarge upon the subject. He will leave it to any competent judge if this is not the idea expressed in his paragraph. This species of hypercriticism must settle the Editor's pretensions to fairness and candour.

Where does J. C. say, even by consequence, that God cannot be omnipotent, unless man is a voluntary agent? But it would be endless to pursue these remarks.

J. C. begs the reader to understand that he does not in general notice these misrepresentations (he hopes not wilfully,) of the Editor, because it would lead to endless altercations.

Answer to Philo-Logos hereafter.

J. C.

ANSWER.

J. C. is correct in the supposition that the mistake in his etymology is a typographical error. But, had he written *definitively* "the term agent is from" *the* "Latin word," in the stead of '*a*', &c. it is presumed there would have been no cause for this complaint.

The Editor has "looked into his dictionary," without increasing his wisdom. And J. C. if he is disposed to introduce a word of *equivocal* meaning, must submit to have his readers consult their own fancy, and choose for themselves a definition which will please them. For it is but fair, that the reader should have the same liberty from *courtesy*, which the writer has from *choice*. The following are among other definitions of the word "*Yield*."—"To *concede*—to *admit*—to *allow*—" &c. vide. Wal. Dict.

J. C. asks, "Where does J. C. say, even by *consequence*, that God cannot be omnipotent, unless man is a voluntary agent?" &c. Here—"It is admitted that God *desires* to do this to *all*. But, it is *contended*, and we trust has been *shown*, that he CANNOT do this to ANY, *except* to those, who by previous acts of preparation on *their* part, have *put themselves* in a *state* of recipiency, by concurring with the Divine operation!" Now if man has not this power of *voluntary agency* himself, he cannot *do*—and without *man* does, "*God* cannot."

We inform J. C. that "misrepresentations" may not be so numerous as he conjectures;—and we are not only willing, but desirous to correct all errors. Whether we have 'wilfully misrepresented,' or not, we leave to the candour of our readers to determine; but we promise, whenever *misrepresentations* are pointed out, to correct them.

For the Gospel Herald.

Remarks on an address delivered to a society for the Investigation and *Establishmeut* of *Gospel truth*, [alias Rellyanism.]

If these remarks cause a deeper investigation of the truth of the true gospel, and help to convince the Rellyans of their error and absurdity; and show how they ought to seek an establishment in the truth, I shall be satisfied.

The orator has in the Herald violently opposed the Arminian doctrines of condition, free-agency and probation; and maintained the Calvinian doctrines that are adverse to them, and which make all men mere machines; or beings incapable of doingany thing, but what they are necessarily compelled to do. But if men are bond-agents, not free-agents, men cannot sin; and if sin exists in all men, all men are free-agents; and salvation from sin is *conditional*. That none but a free-agent can sin, has been proved in some preceding numbers of the Gospel Herald. But, allowing the Editor to be right in his Rellyanistic Calvinism, and that the *purpose, decrees*, and *counsels* of God are unconditional, sure and immutable, (which has been affirmed) and that all things and events are unconditionally predestinated according to these counsels, purposes and decrees;—then I perceive no good motive by which to acount for the orator's beating the tocsin to arms, and calling upon his social brethren 'To put on the whole armour of God and fight,'—as if he and his brethren could save the lost-saved universe! He exclaims to them—"Brethren, our cause is the cause of the *universe!*" If free-agents cannot through grace given them, save an universe, what can bond-agents, or those who are not free-agents, do in their might for an universe of worlds? Indeed *they* can do nothing: God must do all: and who can hinder his arm of salvation, where all are bond-agents, and none are free? Ans. None can hinder. Why then are not all men saved, sanctified and perfected *now*? Why is salvation not completed? Rellyans hold a finished salvation. Why are not all men *now* happy and holy, if God does all, and men have no free-agency, nor condition in salvation? If Jesus Christ *hath* saved, justified and *sanctified* us; then he "hath *perfected* for ever them that are sanctified." If we are *perfected*, we must be *holy* and *happy;* and will continue so, for ever. Why does not God (since he does all; and we bond-agents can do nothing, as the orator seems to think) *make* all unholy and miserable men holy and happy *now*? If he does not make us bond-agents so *now*, or in time, he may not do it hereafter, or in eternity. If it is just, we bond-agents should be punished for sin in this world of time; and we certainly are punished;—it may be just to punish in the world of eternity! If God does all unconditionally, why is not all done? We are afflicted in this world. Does he derive pleasure in bond-agents being *sufferers* in time? If he does, we have reason to fear we shall suffer in eternity for ever; seeing it is said he is *unchangeable*. It is therefore evident, that the denial of free-agency, condition and probation to man, blasphemes God, and terminates in the dreadful idea of eternal misery, which endures through time and eternity. Let this be investigated closely.

Again--Why does the orator preach the necessity of *contending* and fighting against principalities and powers, and spiritual wickednesses in high *places*, if the *work* of salvation by Jesus Christ is finished and completed; and man can do nothing toward saving any one? Why in such a case should he advise his brethren, to "take the *sword* of the Spirit?" Again; What kind of a sword is this? Is it the *flaming* sword that guards the tree of life? Is it a Divine light or principle within man? Is it the good *word* of God, which may be felt, handled, and tasted? And is *God* this *word*, quick, and powerful, and piercing, sharper than a two-edged sword, a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart? &c.

Probably he, as well as many others, believes the *sword of the Spirit* (which is said to be the *word of God*) is the *Holy Bible*. If our Bible, which some call *God's word*, is the *word of God*, the Bible is God: for John i. says, the word was God and made all things; and James i. 21. says the ingrafted *word* is able to *save souls*, which is the office of Christ. The Apocalypse calls Jesus Christ the word of God; and we know that the *Bible* is not Jesus Christ nor God. If the orator, therefore, supposes the sword of the Spirit is the Bible, or the texts contained in it; and he and his brethren fight with the sword of the Spirit, when he flourishes the Scriptures, instead of using the Holy Spirit, hé is lamentably deceived by his teachers.

The text of the orator is, "United we stand, divided we fall." Has he not said elsewhere, all men are *in Christ*, who, (according to his blasphemous interpretation,) is the head of the most *vicious*, as well as the most virtuous of the human race? If all are in Christ, then all are *united*, Rom. xii. 5. for Paul says, Gal. iii. 28. "Ye are all *one* in Christ Jesus;" consequently all are united to *oneness*, and their standing is sure. And if men are not free-agents, how can men sin, divide or *fall out* of Christ? Can those bond-agents who are united in Christ, sin, divide and fall? Can they get out of the unity of the Holy Spirit, and its attendant peace? The text of the Address therefore, appears inconsistent with the sentiments of Rellyanism. I mention these things to show the error of the Rellyan hypothesis and key of their Scripture interpretation. According to the Rellyan Universalists of New-York, it appears all are of and in Christ Jesus, their supposed Head: and though thousands should live and die the worst of sinners, and the most injurious and villainous of civil society, they enter heaven as soon as they depart from their bodies. If this is true, what shall hinder people who believe such a doctrine, from pursuing pleasures, to the utter destruction of the lives and properties of their fellow-creatures? or from murdering themselves, and others, when grievously or continually in distress? Would this not subvert social order, and destroy all confidence and safety? That belief that makes crimes nothing worthy of fear, cannot be an evangelical verity. It cannot be the burning light or candle of the Lord. Yet the orator declares, "we believe our *candle* [meaning it seems his Universal creed] is the candle of the Lord; and is lighted with the Spirit of Divine truth;" for they think they have found Universal Salvation, the treasure of the Gospel, and the lost piece of money. If he and his fellows therefore, are in Christ, and so new creatures, 2 Cor. v. 17. they are no longer poor; their sufferings are at an end, the fatted calf is killed, &c. "We *were*, says he, spiritually poor, and blind, and naked." How are you *now*? Saved. Well! Have you no filthy rags? *No*. Are you clothed with the white robes of Christ's righteousness, as becomes the members of the body of Christ, the Head of the body, the Church, which is holy, and the pillar and ground of truth? Do you say *yes*? And are you now rich, and have you recovered your sight? Do you say *yes*? If you say yes, and all men, good and bad, are *liars*, is this a lie? But supposing you do not err in answering yes, to the questions, then it is evident you are the *white sons*, or white folks. "What we *once* were, (says the orator,) millions *now* are." *These* Rellyans were *once afar* from their Father's house, but are *now in it*, I presume; since they are for *compelling* the multitude to come in, and fill their Father's house. Is the Father's house the church militant? And will he by you compel us to be soldiers or prisoners? But the orator has said, all are in Christ; how then are any out of his church, or body, or house?—Such absurdities he must reconcile, not I; and if he does not, ought the orator to presume that his motives for proselyting the *millions* of whom he spoke, are as pure as they should be?

"The faith of Abraham, who *believed God*, (says the Rellyan orator) is the faith, and the *only faith* we acknowledge." What does *believing God* signify? *Believing*, is similar to *serving God*.—As it is our duty to *serve God* rather than man; so it is our duty to *believe God* in preference to believing all other *true* testimonies. When there was no *Bible* to believe, Abraham believed *God:* for God appeared unto Abraham, and spoke to him, at different times. Abraham believed God, therefore, immediately; and not through the medium of books, or ministers, or prophets, or any other medium, that witnessed for God. Abraham's *faith* was, therefore, not *mediate*, but *immediate*. We do well to believe the writings of the prophets and apostles, who *believed the teachings* of God's Spirit without a medium, as Abraham did; but we do much better to believe the *immediate word* or revelation of the Lord himself, whenever he speaks to us immediately, or in the centre or bottom of our souls. It is one thing therefore to believe the holy testimonies of men who speak or write; and it is another thing to believe the testimony of God himself without human tongue or pen. The command by John in his Apocalypse, is,--"He that hath an ear to hear, let him hear (and believe) what God's *Spirit* saith to the churches." For thus to believe God, was or is the same faith that Abraham had, who when our Bible was not, *believed God* the faithful and true witness. If we believe the witness of holy men, the witness of a holy God is greater; and should be preferred by us, that we might have the faith of Abraham. If therefore, the faith of Abraham is the *only faith* of the orator and his company, they must have been favoured to hear and believe the immediate voice of the Lord, without the *medium* of Bible or person; consequently they believe, and know that *immediate inspiration and revelation* is continued. Will they acknowledge they *believe* and *know* this? Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness. How these white clothed and rich Rellyans in Christ and new creatures, 2 Cor. v. 17. can be accounted *righteous* in believing God, and yet be at the same time unrighteous and the *chief of sinners*, I cannot comprehend.

I have written in compliance to Dean's request, though I expect the Editor will cut and thrust with

his *sword of the letter*, as usual. I am weekly disappointed in seeing no more of the beautiful, sweet and lucid productions of *Impartialist*, who like the sensitive plant, shrinks from the touch of controversy.

REMARKS.

Our readers are unquestionably apprised of the cause of Philotheus's hostility to the Scriptures. His former communications, in which he advocated the works and righteousness of the *creature*, in opposition to the grace of God in *Christ*, must be fresh in their memories. On the whole, however, we are glad to see Philotheus come again. He took rather a ceremonious leave, some months since; and his present visit is an evidence of his having, on reflection, reduced his demands a little. And although he is determined to persist in error, we think there is no great danger of his disseminating his opinions, unless he can introduce them in a more tempting shape than they have heretofore assumed.

Passing by his exordium, which is, as usual, we notice the following—"Why does not God, since he does all, and we bond-agents can do nothing, &c. make all unholy and miserable men holy and happy *now*? If he does not make us bond-agents so *now*, or *in time*, he may not do it hereafter or in eternity. If it is just we bond-agents should be punished for sin in this world of time, and we certainly are punished, it may be just to punish in the world of eternity." Let us pursue this—If it is just in God to be "good to *all*, and his tender mercies" to be "over *all* his works," in *this* world, it is just in God to be good to *all* in *another* world! But Philotheus must first prove, that "bond-agents," (if he pleases so to designate men) will sin in another world. The Scriptures declare of our Maker, that "He is a just God, and a Saviour." Consequently, if "*all* have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being *justified* freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ," (Rom. iii. 23, 24.) it is just in God to make all happy in a future world. Is it just in Philotheus, when "God has sworn by himself, that in Christ all the families of the earth shall be blessed," to say, "If he does not do it *now*, or in time, he may not do it in eternity?" Philotheus is not willing to *believe* God. And what does his language import, but this? If God does not fulfil his promises in this life, *now*, perhaps he will *never* fulfil them! Let him "pull the beam out of his *own* eye."

Philotheus again asks—"If God does all unconditionally, why is not all done? We are afflicted in this world; does he derive pleasure in bond-agents being sufferers in time? If he does, we have reason to fear we shall suffer in eternity, for ever; seeing it is said he is unchangeable." Philotheus having found that his arguments against the truth are ineffectual, has varied his attack; and now would by stealth impose premisses and conclusions upon us, which we have not sanctioned in any manner whatever. It is our uniform doctrine, that God has *no pleasure* in the sufferings of his creatures. Let Philotheus read the following, and remember it—Rom. viii. 20, 21. "For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, (gladly) but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in *hope*; because the creature (creation of God) itself also *shall be delivered* from the bondage of corruption, into the *glorious liberty of the children of God.*" Is the *hope* Paul speaks of, justly described by Philotheus, in saying, "If God does not make us happy *now*, he may not do it *hereafter*?" And when Paul says, the "*creation shall* be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," does he mean, "If he does not make us so *now*, or in time, he may not do it *hereafter*, or in eternity?" Philotheus adds—"It is therefore evident, that the denial of free-agency, conditions, and probation to man, blasphemes God, and terminates in the *dreadful* idea of eternal misery, which endures through *time* and eternity." And this from a man, who has laboured hard to establish a doctrine, which, if true, would damn with eternal misery, ninety-nine out of a hundred of the human race!

Philotheus, in his third paragraph, alluding to the Address, &c. asks, "Why preach the necessity of contending and fighting against principalities and powers, and spiritual wickednesses in high places, if the *work* of salvation by Jesus Christ is finished, and completed?" &c. *Ans.* Because there are multitudes of unbelievers and enemies to the truth, who "would put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we are able to bear. But we believe, that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved even as they!" Acts xv. 10, 11.

Philotheus, in his fourth paragraph, argues, that if we "suppose the sword of the Spirit is the Bible, or the texts contained in it, and that we fight with the sword of the Spirit when we flourish the Scriptures, &c. we are lamentably deceived." Philotheus, however, thinks he "fights with the sword of the Spirit," when he flourishes the crooked opinions of Barclay; and we believe he does; but it is the sword of a spirit which is as different from the Spirit of Christ, which moved the prophets and apostles, as truth is different from error. We consider the Scriptures to be the word of God, in the same sense the written declarations of a man are his word; and the equivocating subterfuges of the Quakers in this particular, are wretchedly pitiful beyond description. They know better; and we tell them, that we consider the Scriptures to be the revealed will of God, communicated by him to the prophets and apostles, whose testimony is supported by undoubted miracles. And that the Spirit of God indited their writings; and that we wield the sword of that Spirit, by wielding the *truth* communicated by the Spirit! *Our sword is truth*, agreeably to that declaration, "Sanctify us by thy *truth*; thy *word* is *truth*." And these apostles and prophets, thus inspired and commissioned, their testimonies are *despised* by Philotheus, who pretends to a testimony of greater veracity—his *own!* Our declaration, quoted from an inspired apostle, that "Christ is the head of every man;" and that "ye are all one in Christ Jesus," he calls a *blasphemous* interpretation. But to contradict Paul, and deny his testimony, is, with Philotheus, an evidence of holiness. Let Philotheus prove the truth of his testimony, and in evidence of having the Spirit of God in him, *heal the sick with a word!* Until he can do this, let him retire, and no longer pester society with pretensions, which are unsupported by any thing, save his own assertions. The Spirit of God is unchangeable—God, who testified by the prophets and apostles, would, were he to inspire Barclay, or Philotheus, inspire them with the same spirit he inspired the apostles; and did God speak by *them*, he would speak the same truths he spake by the apostles. The Spirit of God would not declare at *one* time, that "Christ *was* the head of every man," and at *another*, that the declaration is *blasphemous!* But there is an incontestable evidence, which sweeps away with the besom of refutation these cobweb pretensions, and leaves the truth gloriously triumphant. Christ declared, "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." None of the true apostles of Christ, who had his Spirit, remained *silent* for hours, from mental inanition, while hundreds were waiting for instruction. And we appeal to Philotheus, whether the Scriptures ever represent the Spirit of God as *dumb*? and whether he would be ambitious of possessing any of those spirits, which in the days of the apostles were *dumb*?

Philotheus in his fifth paragraph remarks, "Has he not said elsewhere, all men are in Christ, who, according to this blasphemous interpretation, is the *head* of the most *vicious*, as well as the most *virtuous* of the human race." The following is a true mirror for Philotheus to see himself, stript of his *conceited* notions of his *own* goodness—Rom. iii. 21—24. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of *God* by faith of Jesus Christ (not the righteousness, or faith of *man*,) unto *all*, and upon *all* them that believe; for *there is no difference!* for *all have sinned* and come *short* of the glory of God; being *justified freely* by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

Let Philotheus reply to this, and not as usual, either *evade* answering, or introduce a species of reply which savours more of deism than Christianity! Let him prove that *all* are not "*justified freely*"—and that the redemption, instead of being "*in Christ*," is in a *man's* own self! Philotheus continues—"If *all* are in Christ, then all are *united*," &c. True, all are united in him. See Ephes. ii. Heb. ii. 11. "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified *are all of one*; for which causes he is not ashamed to call them brethren." Compare this with 14 ver. and Rom. iii. 20—24. v. 8—10. Ephes. ii. &c

Although charity might authorize the supposition that Philotheus is not capable of understanding plain English; yet we cannot, on the whole, believe he is so stupid as to have mistaken, and misconstrued our repeated declarations, that "our life is hid with Christ in God;" and that we in *ourselves* distinctly considered from Christ, our head, are sinful and corrupt, &c. Now we had much rather be subjected to have his *sneers* directed against us, than to have that foolish conceit of ourselves, to suppose that *we* are perfect, and our neighbours sinners! and we advise Philotheus, if he cannot produce any thing from the Scriptures, at least to conform to reason in his attempts (not at refutation, that with *him* is out of the question, but) at finding fault! It is a common remark—That a man to be believed should, in his declarations, speak as though he believed what he is relating *himself*. And we advise Philotheus, in future, to associate a degree of candour, and occasionally reason, to say nothing of producing testimony from the Scriptures, which would entitle him to more honesty of intention, purity of motive, and chance of success! declarations without proof, are growing rather stale—and repetition of positions, which have been again, and again confuted, may occupy *spaces* but like a Ghost, although they might alarm the ignorant, will never be taken by the sober well-informed, for anything but the phantom of a diseased and crooked imagination. We really wish Philotheus would raise up something, which should assume the *appearance* of an argument, for we are sensible that our readers, so often cheated by him with false hopes, and disappointed in their expectations, must read his productions with a mental craving, which increases, in the stead of diminishing, their desire for truth; and disappointment at finding little else but error.

ANSWER TO J. C. CONCLUDED.

J. C. in his *fifth* paragraph remarks—"The progress of *regeneration* is twofold. A change wrought first in the *understanding*, and secondly in the *will*. "Why did not J. C. produce his evidence for this, (to his hypothesis,) important declaration? Is it consistent in J. C. to expect the public will, from courtesy, attach as much credit to his opinions, as they would to the scriptures? And if it is not expected, why not produce evidence from the scriptures to support him in his declarations? How can a man, who "by nature is *evil*," and whose "propensities and desires *all* tend towards *evil*," make an advance to *good*? or, 'consent' or '*co-operate*' in a spiritual work,-without having *good desires*? And how can a man have *good* desires, (*spiritually* good,) when *all* his propensities and *desires* tend towards evil? But to make this inconsistency still more glaring, J.C. in his last paragraph says, "It is admitted that God *desires* to do this to *all*. But it is *contended*, and we trust has been shown, that he *cannot* do this to *any*, except to those, who, by *previous* acts of preparation on their part, have put *themselves* in a state of recipiency, by concurring with the Divine operation." Is a man in a natural state, which is confessedly so destitute of good, that "all his propensities and desires tend towards evil"—is it "contended" that he by 'previous' acts which must of necessity be while "*all* his propensities and desires tend towards *evil*, put *himself* in a state of recipiency, by concurring with the divine operation?" Has J.C. consulted his '*Dictionary*' previously to introducing his word 'recipiency.' What shall we understand by the word '*recipient*? Does it mean a '*receiver*,' or that to which any thing is communicated?' If so, What does 'recipiency' mean? Does it mean a state in which *alone* it is possible to receive? Did God make man, and place him in a state, in which it is impossible for man to *receive*? And is man 'on his *part*' to

extricate himself from this state? And except he does it, can he never have any thing *spiritually* good communicated to him by his Maker? We appeal to the common sense of our readers, and ask Is not this absurd? But the scriptures shall settle the question. Rom. viii. 21. "Because the creature itself also *shall be delivered* from the *bondage* of *corruption*, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." Will J. C. "*contend* that God *cannot* do this to *any* except to those, who by previous acts of preparation on *their* part put *themselves* in a state of *recipiency*," ? &c. If so, let him prove it!

J. C. in his *sixth* paragraph, remarks—"What this consent, or co-operation is, is plainly declared in the Scriptures;—'Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings, *cease* to do evil, *learn* to do well." And adds, "That man has the ability, *derived from God*, to do this, is plain from the very circumstance that he is commanded to do it." We now ask—If man has an ability '*derived from God*,' where is the propriety in saying, "that God *cannot* do this to any, except to those, who by previous acts and preparation on *their* part, have *put themselves*," &c. &c. Does J. C. mean by 'deriving ability from God,' a man's putting himself in a state of *recipiency*? If so, we tell him, that he is a very eccentric logician!

J. C. says, "When man does *his* part—God will not fail to *do his*." This is an old hackneyed Arminian saying! Let us examine it. 'When man does *his* part—God will do *his*.' Then God will do as *much* as man—but man must do *first!* Let us *reverse* it—"When God does *his* part—man will do *his!*" God is the *giver*—man the *receiver*. This cannot be *controverted!* No! Never! Now try the Arminian logic. When man *receives*—God will *give!* We think the notion of *receiving* a thing *before* it is given, would pass for something, which in grammar is neither *feminine* nor *neuter!* Now we are free to acknowledge, that the Beneficent Parent of the universe will never be outdone by poor ignorant, impotent man. Therefore, it may safely be relied upon, that whenever man does *his* part, He will do *his*. The Arminian saying, however, although it does not absolutely imply that God will not do *his* part, until man does *his*, common consent among a certain class of religionists have taken for granted, that this is the case. Paul, an apostle of Christ to the Gentiles, has said, "For if when we were *enemies*, we were *reconciled* to God by the death of his Son; *much more*, being reconciled, we shall be saved by *his life*." The reader by comparing J. C.'s declarations with this declaration of an inspired apostle, will discern the astonishing difference which exists between *truth* and *error!*

From the London Universalist's Miscellany.

A FRAGMENT.

"WHY should I not esteem a Catholic or Quaker?" said Candidus, "there certainly are good men of all parties." Diotrephes put on a look of importance, and asserted that there could be no real goodness in man, whose faith was erroneous. Candidus smiled. Diotrephes frowned. Christophilos began a tale. "My neighbour Petilian, who is a Catholic," said he, "had an only son, who disgraced his family, wasted his property, half broke his father's heart, and fled, all profligacy and diseases as he was, abroad." Petilian never forgot he had a son, often wept at the recollecting it, and grew gray with hoping against hope, that he should live to clasp his penitent son in his arms. After twenty, five years, in which he had often been informed that his son was alive, but became worse and worse Rufus, a rough but honest and benevolent captain of a ship, came to pay Petilian a visit; "Pardon me Petilian, if I ask when you heard of your son." The old gentleman took out his handkerchief and wiped his eyes. "I can give you some intelligence of him, added Rufus, and on the whole not unpleasant." Petilian looked hard at him, his jaw quivered, he drew himself forward, sat on the edge of the front of his chair. "Rufus added, he is become a Quaker."—Petilian lifted up one hand, the tears ran down from both his eyes, and exclaimed, "is he alive!" "He is alive and well." "My son!" "Yes, your son; I have seen him and conversed with him, and what I tell you is true." Petilian fainted. Rufus recovered him, and when he was cool told him. I have been abroad. One day a shipwright, a blunt man, came on board, and told me that he had reproached your son with his conduct, in a manner so forcible, that he could not resist it, and that in consequence of the remonstrances of his own conscience, excited by his conversation, he had laid aside the practice and quenched the love of vice, and that he now for four years past had lived a life of devotion, temperance, and justice. After his reformation he had gone to work with this shipwright, he had married his daughter, and was led by that family into that mode of Christianity, which we call Quakerism, for the shipwright himself was a friend, and occasionally held forth on the nature and practice of virtue in a little assembly of his own people. I was curious to see him, and went with my informer on shore. There I found him with his broad brim, eating his morsel with his Abigail, one of the neatest women, and two fine children, the eldest of whom is the picture of yourself, and called friend Petilian, after thee. I proposed an interview with you, which he refused with tears of the most unaffected repentance for his sins, and expressions of esteem for your virtue. He said, I ought to ask pardon of my father, and I would, but, recollect Captain, my father is a man of birth, fortune, and fashion, and of the Roman Catholic religion. Thou wilt forgive me,' if I say I fear the prejudices of that very virtuous man will not allow him to take pleasure in me, now that a change so barbarous in his eye, hath taken place in me, for virtue unaccompanied with the gayety of the world, and the ceremonies of the church, hath no being, much less beauty in the eyes of such men. I think, therefore, on the whole, that it would be an act of cruelty to disturb the peace of my father: perhaps he hath long ago buried me in his imagination, and it would revive his grief to raise me from the dead. I trust, at the resurrection of the last day, the Infinite Mercy of God will make the sight of me an addition to his joy." Rufus paused,—Petilian wept, and exclaimed, "O that I could see him, probably I might engage him to lay aside his garb of virtue, without endangering his virtue itself." "O no," said Rufus, "it would be dangerous to make the attempt, beside, he is an inconvertible man. You must either see him as he is, or never see him at all." "Is it possible to see him?" "It is. I have prevailed with him, and brought him and his family over." "Holy virgin!" exclaimed Petilian, "Where is he? I must see him. I have forgiven him. I feel I love him. I long to embrace him. I have already forgotten, and I will never recollect the impropriety of any means made use of to recover a sinner from the error of his way, and to fill a father with a joy like that of God, when he embraces a long lost, once prodigal, but now penitent son." "Come then, said Rufus, give passage to the finest emotions of the human heart, your son saith, in language canonized by both your churches, *Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy Son: make me as one of thy hired servants;* and he is now saying this, all heretic as he is, in a house where I have desired him to wait. You *have compassion*, Petilian. *Go, run, fall on his neck and kiss him*, and then *let us all*, in spite of forms, *eat and be merry*, for

Pleasure and praise run through God's host,
To see a sinner turn;
Then Satan hath a captive lost,
And Christ a subject born.

From the Philadelphia Reformer.

MODERN MISSIONARIES.

(*Continued.*)

"I have said that Missionaries have but little knowledge of the worth of property; I will give an instance or two.—About two years ago, one of the Missionaries came from St. Louis to Kentucky, on a begging tour. (This is not uncommon with Missionaries.) The object was to build a needlessly great meeting-house in the town of St. Louis, as noticed before. He could say to a man in Kentucky, in middling circumstances, 'I shall think it very hard if you do not give me 50 dollars, to help pay for my meeting-house,' 400 miles from where the man lived. In Elkhorn Association, while this same Missionary was there, a proposition was made to pay the clerk of the Association for his services. Fifteen dollars was proposed, which was about three times as much as their clerk generally received for such services. The Missionary rose up (as I was told) and insisted that forty dollars was as small a sum as the clerk could do it for.

"Having gone through the Missouri, we will return to Kentucky, and take a little further view of Missionary movements there. In October 1813, a Missionary Society was formed in Richmond, Virginia; in imitation of which a society of the same cast was formed at South Elkhorn in Kentucky, in February 1814; but progressed but feebly till August 1815, when the great —— appeared at Elkhorn Association, and like Tetzel in Germany, gave life and wing to the Missionary cause through the whole state of Kentucky. His collections at different Associations were immense; for he attended most of the Baptist councils in the state, and they uniformly, to gratify him, went into a correspondence with the great Board of Foreign Missions. A collection took place as a thing of course, and especially if they first received the entering wedges, (the first report of the great Board.) This riveted the yoke, which cannot be shaken off till that correspondence is dropped; and thanks to a kind Providence, a number of the Associations have found a way to get rid of it, though with much difficulty in some places.

"Elkhorn Association is perhaps stronger in the faith of Missions, than any other in the state, which can be accounted for, partly because all the officers of the Kentucky board belong to that body, and partly because the profits, some day, may be an ample reward. It was a little amusing to see the movements of the Elkhorn people, at their last Conference.—A small church at Mountain Island, of twenty-four members, had complained warmly against doing any Missionary business in the Association, and appeared conscientious in their remonstrances. For satisfaction these cunning men refer them to their minutes, which were one uniform essay on Missions. Their long-winded circular was chiefly on that subject, and is a flagrant insult on common sense; none but its own author ought ever to read it, or any other Missionary tale, much less to read it in an Association. For the mournful and devotional tone, in which he reads all those tales, strikes you through with conviction, and draws involuntary tears from your eyes. It was this passed his circular; for all was dumb with silence, though twenty-seven members voted against its being their circular to the churches. Here is Missionary influence, with a witness! For my own part, being only a corresponding member, I was also silent, concluding as the Saviour directed, to let them alone—for they were blind leaders of the blind, and would not receive conviction till they all fell in the ditch together—which I think is not very distant."

Note. We are under the necessity of continuing this article, and concluding it in our next.

INTOLERANCE.

When the King of Prussia entered Silesia the first time, a little Protestant town, jealous of a Catholic village, came humbly to request permission of the King, to put all the inhabitants of the village to the sword. The king replied to the deputies, "If that village were to ask my permission to cut your throats, would you think I did well in granting it?,' "Oh, gracious Sovereign," said the deputies, "that would be a very different thing, *we are of the true church.*" *London Universalist Miscellany.*

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 454 Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY AT $3 PER ANNUM, PAYABLE SIX MONTHS IN ADVANCE

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1821. NO. 50.

An Exposition of Luke xvi.

(*Concluded from page* 193.)

"*And Abraham saith unto him, they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.*"

The solicitude expressed by the '*rich man*' for his 'five brethren,' is expressive of a benevolent desire for the happiness of others, which ill comports with the dispositions of the damned in the *hell* of our modern religionists. They represent the damned as destitute of every principle of goodness—every exercise of benevolence; and their mouths continually vomiting blasphemies! We think this figure in the parable strongly illustrative of the effect of misfortune upon the mind of man. And these Jews who dwelt at Jerusalem, and who during their prosperity, were so haughty and imperious in their carriage towards their brethren, at Samaria, are no sooner plunged in misfortune and trouble, than the best feelings of their hearts, which had so long remained dormant, are called into action, and a friendly solicitude takes the place of pride, distrust and hatred. The Jews at Samaria, although plunged in open idolatry through the jealousy of their king, who to prevent their going to Jerusalem to worship in the temple, made them gods, &c. were, with little exception, not more ignorant of their Maker, or more estranged from him, than their brethren at Jerusalem. They "had Moses and the prophets." They had all the testimonies relative to the Messiah, who had then come, and were alike inexcusable in refusing to acknowledge him. They were, therefore, included in the judicial sentence, and cast off; and remain at this day mingled in common and undistinguished infidelity with their brethren.

"*And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent.*"

This is illustrative of a strong and prominent feature in the character of man. And although there are some who deny that a necessity, or even propriety ever existed, of any immediate revelation from God to man, there are others, and by far the most numerous, who demand a *new* and more signal revelation from heaven, if possible, than any yet made to man. Why, say they, should we be called upon to believe the declarations of men, who have slumbered in dust, during the revolutions of so many centuries? Why not make to us, the same revelations, and the same communications, which were made to the prophets and apostles? Why demand of us, an implicit faith in traditionary testimony, when others have been favoured with occular demonstration? We answer—the ways of God, are to man, dark and mysterious. And although we have abundant testimony in the Scriptures, to assure us that 'God is good to all, and his tender mercies over all his works;' and that the Jews in God's own, and the best time, will be brought in with the fulness of the Gentiles, still it is manifest, that the Gentiles, in our day, possess a superior and more incontestable evidence of the truth of the Divine testimony, from the very circumstance of the Jews every where being living, and unanswerable witnesses of the accomplishment and fulfilment of the prophecies, in their dispersion, and the certain advent of the Saviour of the world. It is worthy of remark, that if infidelity consisted in *ignorance* of, in stead of *denying* the truth, that the human race, en masse would be infidels in their infancy at least. God never requires impossibilities of man. And let our sticklers for *free-agency*, remember, that spiritual things are illustrated and explained by natural things—and let our expositors of the Scriptures, who are in the practice of *tormenting* spiritual things, until all reason and analogy is hunted and expelled from their expositions, let them, too, remember, that if the evidence in one case, was not as plain as it is in the other, and man under advantages to compare truth and error, and receive, and reject, as evidence may authorize, the error, that he never could suffer from any mistakes of his own making; and that all attempts to set him right would be useless.

The Jews were in possession of testimony which they were free to acknowledge was truth. That testimony was, that Christ the Messiah should come, &c.—that he should reign over them, and deliver them;—but they, although they expected him at the time he did come, refused him, because he would not give them a temporal sovereignty over the world, and enable them to lord and tyrannize over others. And this, when all the prophecies, in which they pretended to believe and trust, represented him as a Saviour, in the stead of a destroyer, and that peace, and not war, was the characteristic of his kingdom. The Jews are not alone. How many in our day reject the Saviour, who comes in "peace and good will to man," and desire a *destroyer*, who will sweep, with the besom of destruction, their enemies to hell, and give them an exclusive dominion! How unlike the subjects, was such a King? While peace, like a river, flowed in honeyed accents from his mouth—while persuasion distilled from his lips—and heaven-born charity, in tones sweeter than angels sing, soothed the discordant passions which agitated the bosoms of his followers, and love, Almighty love, encircled with radiant glory his hallowed brow—when opening heavens witnessed the Divinity of his mission and proclaimed his authority, even then, the Jews rejected this testimony, and said, We will not have this man to reign over us! Let the Jews compare the prophecies with the advent of Christ, and the testimony is so incontestably strong, that reason, as well as revelation, declares, "*If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.*"

It is proper to remark, that as the *grave* (*Hades*) is introduced as the figure to illustrate the *darkness* of the minds of the Jews, and their blindness to the testimonies of all the prophecies relative to Christ, so the rising from the *dead*, is figurative of a release from this state of darkness; and not, as many suppose, a literal coming back of a person from the world of Spirits, and communicating to them the truth. That they would not *believe*, though one literally rose from the *dead*, is a fact. For Christ rose from the *dead*, and was seen of above *five hundred* after his resurrection! And these very Jews so far from giving heed to *this* truth, actually denied that he rose at all! The rising from the *dead*, therefore, must be considered to have an exclusive reference to the deliverance of one of the Jews from this mental *darkness*; and though one of them should see the *truth*, and communicate it to his brethren, they would not be *persuaded*, for they reject greater testimony by refusing their assent to Moses (in whom they pretend to trust,) and to *all* the prophets. This parable, therefore, *was a prophecy* of the then *future* state of the Jews, during their cast off state; and with all the parables, was communicated by Christ to his disciples, that they might understand the things of his kingdom, and by these extra and incontestable evidences, "grow strong in the faith, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." The reader, by reflecting a moment, will see the force of these remarks. For the Jews denying that the Gentiles have *any* correct knowledge of the Scriptures, would place more confidence in the testimony of *one* of their own nation, than in *all* the Gentiles put together! But they rejected the counsel of God against themselves; and are in consequence shut up in unbelief, 'until the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in, when all Israel shall be saved.'

Romans xi. 7—12 is illustrative of the truth, that the Jews shall *all* be restored, and received to heaven. Calvinists and Arminians may here read their discomfiture. "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded; (according as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear) unto this day. And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a recompense unto them: Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway. I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but *rather* through their fall salvation *is come* unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. Now, if the fall of them *be* the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness?" The poor Calvinist, when he comes here, is in a dreadful condition. His doctrine of "election and reprobation" falls in a moment, and he has no alternative, but to confess the truth, or *run!* There is not a Calvinist in this city, and we say it boldly, who *dares come forward* and test his doctrine by this chapter! And we tell clergymen of that persuasion plainly, that they themselves are *sensible*, that if their *salaries* were in as great *danger* as their *doctrines* they would be in *arms* at once! This, however, is in perfect accordance with the Scriptures. "For where their *treasure* is, there will their *hearts* be also."

The apostle in the 7th verse, says, "*Israel* hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the *election* hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.' (Quere. "All are *not* Israel that are of Israel." Let the Calvinist tell who are *Israel* here!) What did "Israel seek for?" Ans. Righteousness by, and under the *law!* "But the *election* hath obtained it, and the *rest* were *blinded*." Who were the '*rest*,' who were '*blinded*?' Ans. The *non-elect!* Dispute this who can! Now the 8th verse declares, that they, in contradistinction to the elect, have "the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should *not* see, and ears that they should *not* hear. And David saith, &c. and bow down their back alway. I say then, Have they *stumbled* that they should fall? God forbid; but through their fall salvation *is come* unto the Gentiles, &c. Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; How much more their fulness?" Again, See 25th and 26th verses. "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery (until then a secret.) lest ye should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness in part hath happened to Israel, until the *fulness* of the Gentiles be come in, and so *all Israel shall be saved;* as it is written. There shall come out of Sion the *Deliverer*, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins. As concerning the Gospel *they are* enemies for your sakes; but as touching the election, beloved for the Fathers' sakes." 27th and 28th verses. Here is an Universal and Unconditional Salvation. The "*rich man in hell" is delivered.* Here the whole plan of salvation is explained; and explained too, in language as clear as the noon-day sun. "For the gifts and calling of God *are* without repentance. For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief; even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy. For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all. O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable *are* his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and

to him, *are* all things: to whom *be* glory for ever. Amen.

We conclude our exposition of this interesting chapter, with the words of the apostle, (Rom. xii. 1, 5.) "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the *mercies* (not the *threatenings*) of God, that ye present your *bodies* a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, *which is* your reasonable service. (For) We *being* many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."

From the Philadelphia Reformer.

MODERN MISSIONARIES.

[CONCLUDED.]

"Another bravado of the Kentucky board, was the bringing a tribe of young Indians to this state from Missouri, as if they could not be educated to more advantage in their own village on Merrimack river, than in Kentucky; and as to civilization, they were surrounded by white people where they came from. Lewis Rogers seems to be as civilized a man as those who brought him here; and though —— approves of the plan, it adds no credit to the measure; for with his old school fellows Schermerhorn and Mills, as named before, this Priestly policy is the same.—Only get the people in the habit of giving their money, no matter what it is for, and they will continue to give it for all other purposes. This Indian business is another thirsty daughter of the horse-leech thirsting for blood, crying, *give, give.*

"I did signify in the early part of this essay, that part of the distresses of my old age, was the plan now set on foot by some of the Baptists, for Theological Education; the object of which is to make preachers, preachers of a certain grade, Missionary preachers. And this produces a new clue for begging or teasing the people for more money, with this pretext, *we will make more preachers for you*, as if Jesus Christ did not know how to make preachers for his own use among men. Though the plea is, the state of society calls for it; this is an old error, old as the days of Origen, and one of the first mediums to corrupt the religion of Jesus Christ. Was not the state of society, when Christ was on the earth, as to refinement, equal to what it is now? What kind of men did he make choice of, to bear his name to all the world? He went up into a mountain, and called to him whom he would, and of them he ordained twelve apostles. After this he sent other seventy, and told them to pray the Lord of the harvest to send more labourers into the harvest. What Theological School did he apply to for any of all these? Nothing can offer a greater insult to the Baptists, than to beg of them money, and thereby send them a new race of preachers; such as they have not been used to. By what kind of preachers have the Baptist society risen to what they now are? In Kentucky I suppose they are 20,000 in number. From what Theological School have any of their preachers come? But certain of our great men would have us think, that our homespun preachers have only been converting the vulgar part of the community; but by a more refined kind of preaching, the rich and wise will become converted. What a pity, that these great men cannot be of the same mind of Christ, who rejoiced in spirit that these things were hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes; and with Paul, who says, not many mighty, wise or noble after the flesh, are called: and God delights to take the wise in their own craftiness; to destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent; which will be the fate of these money hunters, if I mistake not; for the people will find out the trick. But this new style of preachers is to be educated on charity. When they leave the school, they will of course be poor, and always be looking and holding out hands for money. Their hands are too delicate either to make tents, or pick up a bundle of sticks, to make a fire to warm themselves as Paul did; and of course, must be the same kind of shameless beggars, that all Missionaries that I have seen, now are. For not knowing the worth of property by labouring for it, they will never think the people give them enough.

"Though, as hinted before, a number of my best friends are some way connected with the Missionary cause, I cannot think better of it than I do of the old pharisaical parade. When I examine it in all its branches, I see a great likeness. Silly admiration is very prevalent. To love greetings in the markets, is very obvious. To love festivity and the chief rooms there, is not out of sight. To be called of men, Rabbi, and mingle much with the great, is very notorious. To make a great show of religion, with a design to devour widows' houses, is strongly suspected; a great hard heartedness respecting a mans's old helpless parents, or his heirs; but great assiduity to obtain a *corbin* or gift to Missionaries; half the estate is not too much. Money and power is the watch-word of the whole scheme; aiming at lordship over God's heritage. They fancy something is done for us when they number Israel, and give us a statement of all the associations. But all this is to show us how great they are, and what a mighty body of people belong to them; which claim is founded on the several associations agreeing to correspond with them; the tenor of which gives them a free hold all over the United States where Baptists are found; and that it is not unreasonable to ask their vassals for money wherever they find them. And hence their boast of 200,000 being in their interest both by their money and their prayers. A little money paid annually, for any one of five or six purposes, somewhat pacifies Missionaries—because that is an earnest of subservience to them; but giving much money being the best evidence that a man is a christian. Heaven is almost secured, as also an honorary seat in any of their councils, on paying 100 dollars.

"I have expressed myself in the foregoing sheets with all the plainness that I think one friend should speak to another.—Perhaps some things may appear harsh; but I know, that for all the men that I have brought in review, I have a sympathizing friendship. It is probable they think they are doing right, though of their sincerity, I have strong doubt.—Happy should I be hereafter to find myself mistaken, and these men what I wish them to be, the faithful servants of Christ. But my great doubt concerning them arises, both from the Scriptures and all the observation and experience I have had for near fifty years. Far back I remember what kind of men of the Baptist name in Virginia, were buffeted, imprisoned, and counted the offscouring of all things. I remember their looks, their labours and success. Though not willing to make myself a standard, I recollect that far back, the anxiety of my soul for the prosperty of Zion and the good of my fellow men, was such, that I could not rest, day nor night, for years together; and of what little moment in that case money appeared to me; so that from my soul I could say, I seek not yours but you. In that case, I coveted no man's silver, gold or apparel; and perhaps to a man, this temper attended all the Baptist preachers of that day. Men bound by the strong cords of love of money, and love of power or fame, are perhaps more to be pitied than blamed. But when men assume to themselves higher ground than others, they are, as a thing of course, taken more notice of than others. I have in taking a survey of those high minded men, narrated a long train of facts, collected, either from their own writings, the use of my own senses, or the report of others in which I confide; all of which I am responsible for, if called on. My object is, if possible, to drive these presuming men out of Baptist Associations, for they are crept in unawares, with no more right there than the false brethren of whom Paul speaks; for they are a motly tribe at best.—I wish it understood, once for all, that when I insinuate corruption among American Baptist Missionaries, I do but sparingly mean men of my own state; for I only think of three in Kentucky, that I suspect, and I rather ascribe it to their weakness and vanity than to corruption—looking perhaps for a thank'e from these great men; or possibly they may look for some profits in future either in money or applause. A well wisher of poor deluded Missionaries."

"JOHN TAYLOR."

"*Franklin County (Ken.)* 1820."

'Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him.' Job.

The above declaration of the patient Job, is a satire upon modern Christians. Job's confidence in God, proceeded not from the spur of the moment. His conduct was uniform. In prosperity, an humble gratitude testified his devotion to his Maker;—and when adversity, clothed in all the terrors of sickness, want and reproach, encompassed him, he was steady in his confidence, and unmoved in his hopes. Modern religionists, however, use a different language. They say, not "though he *slay* me"—but, if I did not think he *would* slay me, I would *not* trust in him! In other words:—If I was *sure* he would *not* slay *me*, I would *not* trust in him—I would "follow the bent of my *carnal heart*," and give a *full* vent to *my* passions, and "enjoy the gratifications of sense," &c. This would come from out the mouth of a slave, smarting under the lash of a *cruel* master, with a good grace; but for any man, making pretensions to Christianity, it is contemptibly and hypocritically disgraceful, to the last extreme. It is high time these Pharisaical pretenders to holiness were *ashamed* of this abominable confession of their own depravity! Let them no longer have the shameless impudence to charge others with disseminating demoralizing and licentious principles, when they in open day unblushingly declare to the world, that all that keeps them from swimming in every enormity, is fear of punishment; and that if *opportunity*, and impunity favoured their *souls desires*, they would drink the cup of every abomination *to the very dregs !!!*

This reader, is an expose of the *confessed* sentiments of our *would-be* judges. Here is a sample of their *purity!* Here is the picture of pretended regenerated men; who claim heaven as their inheritance, of *right*, and would, were it in their power, shut the door of bliss on others, as their *inferiors* in piety! One thing is certain—their enemies, if they have any, could not more effectually disgrace them, than they have disgraced themselves. And if they, on their own confession, go to heaven *without* a change, heaven itself, will be *no* bar to their merging in sin and iniquity, whenever opportunity and probability of impunity should favour the indulgence of passions, which, if *they* can be *believed*, are now not only paramount in their hearts, but would immediately be gratified did not a dread of the consequences keep them in slavish fear!

"If ye Love me ye will keep my Commandments."

This was the declaration of Christ. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." Gratitude is, unquestionably, the strongest incentive to action. It is a devotion of the soul—it is a law in the mind; and binds the whole man fast in a chain, which, if not so *hard*, is at least as *strong* as adamant. Fear of consequences may keep the mind in slavery; and the heart, which struggles like the captive bird to free itself from the snare of the fowler, will sooner or later find an opening, and on the wings of impatience fly to the desired object. "Know thyself," is an important and necessary command. And we believe no man, who is not fettered with spiritual pride, to that degree, that he views almost every thing through a false medium, but would, were he to seclude himself for one hour from the delusive cheating of his own pretensions, and in calm and sober meditation weigh his own *merits* in the *scale* he estimates the worth of *others*, find that he had many *faults* which had escaped his notice, and failings, if not of the same *quality*, at least, of the same *enormity*, of his neighbours!

There is a propriety in thinking well of ourselves; and this in a qualified sense is absolutely necessary. In a world like this, where mankind are so much in the habit of disparaging one another, a man might, by giving too much heed to the reproaches of his judges, sink, even in his *own* mind, below that level, which is necessary to preserve a just equilibrium between the arrogance of presumption, and the despondency of despair. The difficulty, however, seems to lie here;—men are too apt to go to extremes. Instead of estimating things by their proper value, and judging from the dictates of

reason, they exalt a man to heaven, and canonize him a saint, or plunge him down to hell, a devil incarnate. *Error*, is but another name for *ignorance*. And true *wisdom* and *virtue*, are the same. And if that man is wisest, who serves his God the best, it inevitably follows, that a knowledge of his God was the producing cause; and that his devotion must increase in proportion to his gratitude, and his gratitude with his knowledge. The bare supposition that any man can love an object, of which he is *ignorant*, is preposterous and absurd.

The insatiability which so strongly characterizes man, and marks the distinction which exists as a barrier between him, and every other grade of animated nature, is a proof, not more evident than incontestable, of his *heavenly origin*, and the insufficiency of every thing this world can afford, to satisfy his immortal longing. It is a truth, sanctioned by every rational principle, that man would never experience satiety or disgust, in the enjoyment of any supposed good, did he estimate that good according to its real, and not by a fictitious value. And it follows as a consequence, that disappointment must inevitably result from every mistaken calculation, let the object or pursuit be what it may. The abundant provision which God has made to sustain man, and supply his wants, is to the temperate a blessing, without alloy. He eats and rejoices. But the glutton finds a curse in the room of a blessing, and like the toad, extracts poison from the sweetest herbs! The mind of man is in want of food, and suffers as much from inanition, or an over fulness, as the body. But with this difference, that the mind can enjoy without satiety, and receive without disgust, *truth*; which, were the same quantity of *error* received, would amount to mental gluttony, and be productive of disease and pain. How reasonable is it, therefore, to believe, that God has prohibited nothing which could be productive of happiness in the use? And, reasoning from these premisses, how certain, that if we "*love* Him, we shall keep his commandments." And, how necessary the conclusion, that we must first know God, before we can love him, or willingly consent to be guided by Him?

We appeal to the conscience of the reader for the *truth* of the foregoing premisses and conclusions, and ask,—Can that man *love* God, who would *violate* his commands, if he thought he could do it with *impunity*? or *know* God, who keeps his commandments, not from *love*, but from *fear* of punishment, and *dread* of his eternal displeasure? NO!

Note.—The man who confesses that he *serves* God from *fear* of his vengeance, is no hypocrite! And his neighbours, if wise, would put more confidence in good *locks* and *keys*, than in his honest principles!!! Fear of the devil may increase our clergymen's *salaries*, and make *long-faces*; but it will never make *one* Christian!

Controversial.

For the Gospel Herald.

MR. EDITOR.

I have read with some attention your remarks, together with the observations of your correspondents, on the subject of conditional salvation, and I must tell you frankly that you have not yet established your side of the question to my satisfaction. I have in one or two instances requested some explanations of you, but received nothing which appeared to me particularly instructive or to the point. I concluded, therefore, to withdraw for a while, at least, and let you and your other correspodents proceed without me, believing the cause of truth would lose nothing by my silence, especially while so many able writers were coming forward on the same side of the question. But having lately been called upon, through the medium of the Gospel Herald, by our friend Wm. Dean, to come forward again in the cause of truth, I have concluded to make my re-appearance and endeavour to cast my mite into the treasury, hoping by the blessing of heaven some good may arise out of it. I shall therefore proceed to show some of the difficulties and absurdities which arise out of your opinions or doctrines, and leave you to give such explanations and answers as you may feel disposed.

In the first place, you say man is not a free agent. Do let me ask you, how you can predicate happiness, misery, or even accountability of such a being? You might as well say the wheel of a clock or a mill is accountable for any defect in its movements, or durability, and, therefore, deserves to be punished. Here you and the Calvinists, whom you so severely condemn, agree exactly. From the dark pit of Calvinism such absurdities might be expected, but Universalism which possesses so much charity as to be willing that even its enemies should be happy, ought to be more consistent. You both deny the free agency of man.—You both say he can do nothing. You both say that salvation is the arbitrary gift of God.—They say he will bestow it only on a part, and a small part too, of the human race, but you say he will infallibly bestow it upon all. And thus you clear him from some of the foul aspersions that they have heaped upon his character. For they assert that he created a certain part of mankind with the determination to render them eternally miserable.—Impious, indeed, is the assertion! And did the propagators of it only know what they say, it would be horrible blasphemy.—And I cannot help congratulating you, notwithstanding all your absurdities, that you are clear of this. But as you are not a free-agent, you deserve no credit for your opinion —Opinion! did I say?—It is altogether improper. You have no opinion. You are not capable of any. And for this plain reason, because you are not a free-agent.—It follows, therefore, inevitably follows, that you are nothing but a machine propelled by some superior power.

I was not long ago observing a large windmill on Jersey shore.—It made a stately appearance.—It reared its mighty form aloft.—It spread abroad its long and potent arms, and moved them around with much energy and dignity. But notwithstanding all this apparent power and majesty, I could not help exclaiming to myself, it is nothing but a mere machine, after all, and is indebted for all its wondrous movements to the wind that may happen to blow upon it.———When I read the Gospel Herald, I cannot help thinking, that if the Editor speaks the truth in denying free-agency, what a wonderful similarity there is between him and the other machine mentioned above.—I see it (that is the Editor) stand on an eminence, raised by the Gospel Herald.—I see it spread its tremendous arms abroad. I hear its mighty movements.—The very ground seems to tremble beneath it.—The machine itself seems ready to burst with inflation and agitation.—I lay down the paper and cannot help exclaiming to myself, what a wonderful mill this is!—How astonishingly it grinds.—There must be a dreadful wind from some quarter, to produce so much terror, perturbation and noise.—It is a pity that it stands on so bleak a place, for there is danger of its being blown over and dashed to pieces.

Now, Mr. Editor, you must not be offended at this plain treatment, for, according to your doctrine, I am nothing but a machine, and therefore cannot help it. And besides, I am about to make you ample amends, by placing you in very respectable company. I shall allow you to take a seat by the side of the Rev. Drs. Mason, Milledoler, Romeyn, Mc. Clay, Parkinson, Mc. Clelland, Bork, and Van Belyer, &c. and the renowned Dr. Spring, if he should happen to fix upon a predestinarian seat, for it seems by his Election sermon, that he spends much of his time in picking it up and kicking it over again. But all this is very innocent, you know, for according to his doctrine, and yours, too, he is nothing but a machine. It would, therefore, be ridiculous to expect any thing better of him.———All that can be said is, that you and he are frequently acted upon by contrary winds, sometimes you are blown together, and then carried off in tangents with rapidity, dust, and confusion.

If I were to be convinced that God, before the world was created, fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass,—that he predestinated the whole human race to eternal happiness, or eternal misery, or a part to each, for as it respects the free agency of man it is all the same, I say, if I could be convinced of this, it would be impossible for me, not only not to consider you and these Reverend Gentlemen as free agents, but not even as rational beings. And when I hear such torrents of contradictions and absurdities, flow from their pulpits, I must confess I have sometimes been constrained to give a full assent to their doctrine, and of course to the consequent deduction, and immediately fancied, that those mighty and boisterous machines, were nothing but windmills like yourself, and the one at Powles Hook.

Should the Gentlemen, abovementioned, or any of their friends, think that I have treated them unjustly, or harshly, I must request them carefully to weigh my apology, which follows. If their doctrine is true,—if God has foreordained every thing that comes to pass, then it follows, incontestably follows, that it was pre-ordained that I should say and do exactly what I have done. Therefore, no blame can possibly rest on me. If their doctrine is false, then, certainly, I ought not to be condemned for pointing out error. But as I consider myself a free agent, possessed of sufficient power, to refrain from doing what I know to be wrong; I think proper to observe, that I disclaim all intention of saying even one word that should be aimed at private character, or that could hurt the feelings of any person whatever. As to the characters of these Gentlemen whether in a social, private, or literary point of view, so far as I am acquainted with them, they command my high respect. But when they advance error from the pulpit or the pen, I think I have a right to expose it. In the present case I have taken their own premisses. and drawn the conclusions that naturally flow from them. If, therefore, they should be displeased, the fault is their own, and not mine.

TIMOTHEUS.

To be continued.

ANSWER.

In reply to Timotheus' first paragraph, it is proper to remark, that we shall try to give something satisfactory this time. Whether he will be satisfied is another question, and beyond our control.

In his second paragraph, he asks, "How can you predicate happiness, misery, or even accountability of such a being? You might as well say the wheel of a clock, &c. is accountable for any defect in its movements," &c. It is probable there is a misunderstanding between us. Admit man to be a *free agent*, what do you require of him? It is presumed to be, *spiritual goodness*. Now if this can be proved to be beyond his reach, and above his capacity, you are in as great an error, as you suppose we are. Christ says, "No man *can come* to me, except the Father who hath sent me *draw him*." Is man, (the free agent,) *commanded* or *invited* to come to Christ? You must acknowledge there is no other way of salvation. Can he come of his *own* will and power? When you will prove that men are commanded to come to Christ, and that they have the *will* and the power to come, in, and of themselves, then, and not till then, can you consistently contend for, what you call, *free agency*. That man has a power, derived from God, to act, we admit. But we deny that man is *free* to use that power as he pleases. We, likewise, deny that mankind, generally, in this present mode of existence, derive a power from God to come to Christ; for if they had the power, it would be absurd to suppose they would not use it. On this head we hope to be understood. If God communicated power to any man, for any specific purpose, God would be disappointed, and man would prevent his designs from being accomplished, if that purpose was not effected! We believe that when God speaks to any mind, however dark, and says, "*Let there be light*," that light will irradiate that mind; and man be in spiritual subjection to his Maker. Relative to "predicating happiness, misery, or accountability" of man, we observe.—We believe that the "creation of God was made subject to vanity not willingly, (gladly and for no good purpose by God,) but by reason of him (God) who hath subjected the same in hope." We do not admit this *subjection to vanity* to amount to what is generally understood by the term *misery*; for it is declared, that 'the creation *shall be delivered* from the bond-

age of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." And that "the *sufferings* of this *present* time, *are* not worthy *to be compared* with the glory which shall be revealed *in us*." (Rom. viii.) We deny that this deliverance from the bondage of corruption is effected in any shape whatever by mankind; or that their *agency*, call it *free*, or whatever you please, has any thing to do with the matter. We contend that all men are the passive recipients of God, "as clay is in the hands of the potter;" and that God will, in his own good time, and the best time, introduce all men to holiness and happiness! These are our sentiments. If we are *wrong*, we should be glad were we set *right*. But, testimony must be produced, superior to what we have by God's assistance, built our faith upon, before we shall lay another foundation, or attempt to construct another house!

We are free to acknowledge, that we have "*no credit* for our opinion." We have nothing but what we have *received!* Neither do we believe we are *capable* of having a *correct* opinion, only so far as God is pleased in his Infinite wisdom and goodness to enlighten our mind, and instruct us. We, of ourselves, "are *not capable of any*" correct opinions! "Do not err my beloved brethren. Every *good* gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. Of his *own will* begat he us, with the *word of truth*, that we should be a kind of *first fruits* of his creatures." James i. 16.—18.

(*To be continued.*)

Note. Timotheus has brought his *grist* to the *mill*. Let him get clear of the *hopper*, before he tells how it *grinds*!

ANSWER TO PHILOTHEUS.

(*Concluded*)

*Philotheus after remarking that "we are afflicted in this world," asks, "Does he derive pleasure in bond-agents being *sufferers* in time? If he does, we have reason to fear we shall suffer in eternity," &c. See Rom. viii. 18. "For I reckon that the sufferings of this *present time, are* not worthy *to be compared* with the glory which shall be revealed in us." See 2 Cor. iv. 17.

Philotheus in his fifth paragraph remarks. "But the orator has said, *all* are in Christ. How then are any *out* of his church, or body, or house? Such absurdities he must reconcile, not I!" We are of opinion, that Philotheus, if he never attempts to reconcile the absurdities of others, until he effects a reconciliation of his own, will indeed never render assistance to any one. It is a great pity Philotheus is not candid enough to see his own, as well as the supposed errors of others. Now we see no contradiction in the Address which has occasioned him so much trouble. For, although we uniformly declare, that all men are members of the *body of Christ*, their Spiritual Head, we never declare that all *have* a knowledge of their membership and union with him. To *convince* them of this *truth*, is our object. And it is as much a truth *before*, as *after* they believe it!

Philotheus in his sixth paragraph asks, "What does *believing* signify? *Believing*, is similar to *serving* God." Granted. For the man *serves* God when he *believes* Him. This, reader, is Philotheus' own position, now mark *his* consistency. He immediately adds.—"As it is our duty to *serve God* rather than man, so it is our duty to *believe God* in preference to believing all other TRUE testimonies." Reader, what do you think of this? Will God speak different from '*true* testimony?' Look at this,—"We do *well* to believe the writings of the *prophets and apostles*, who believed the teachings of God's Spirit without a medium, as Abraham did; but we do *much better* to believe the *immediate word* or revelation of the Lord himself, whenever he speaks to *us* immediately, or in the *centre* or *bottom* of our souls." In other words.—It may be well enough to believe the *Bible;* but, it is *much better* to believe the *Quakers!* Philotheus continues. "If we believe the witness of holy men, the witness of a holy God is greater; and should be prefered by us, that we might have the faith of Abraham." In other words.—If we believe the Bible, the witness of a *holy Quaker* is *greater*, and should be *prefered* by us, that we might have the faith of a Quaker! If Philotheus complains of our paraphrase, let him answer.—Can you prove that the prophets and apostles, and Abraham, testified *different* from what the *Spirit* of God *revealed unto them?* If you cannot, except you are a downright *infidel*, you must admit, that the Spirit of God, being *unchangeable*, will testify the *same now*, if he makes any revelation or communication to any man, that He testified to *Abraham* and the *prophets* and *apostles!* We tell Philotheus, that he ought to be ashamed of himself. That he has no testimony nor authority to produce, but his *own corrupt heart* and imagination! And except he in future is honest enough to confess his infidelity, and come forward in the true shape of a deist, or acknowledge the *Scriptures* to be a Divine revelation, and of more weight than his *own* assertions, we shall commit his communications to the fire! Our Prospectus declares, that "the *Scriptures* are the source *alone* from which *truth* is to be *obtained*;" not the head, or heart, of an unbelieving Quaker. Again.—"The columns of this paper will be open to all *religious* sects," &c. Not to those who deny the Bible to be a revelation from God, and of *less* authority, than the opinions of men, who have nothing to recommend them but their *arrogance!* For we are determined, agreeably to the advice of an apostle, "A *heretic*, after the first and second admonition, *reject!*"

Philotheus continues.—"How these white clothed and rich Rellyans in Christ and new creatures, 2 Cor. v. 17. can be accounted *righteous* in believing God, and yet be at the same time *unrighteous* and the *chief* of *sinners*, I cannot comprehend." See 2 Cor. v. 16, 17, 18. "Wherefore, henceforth know we no man after the flesh: Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. (after the *flesh.*) Wherefore, if any man in Christ, a new creature, old things are passed away, behold all things are become new. And all things of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ,"&c. With Paul, we know all men after the Spirit in Christ, reconciled unto God by Jesus Christ, and new creatures; agreeably to the declaration, "Behold, I make all things new." Again,—"Ye are dead, and your *life* is hid with Christ in God. But we see not *yet* all things put under (reconciled unto) him. But we see Jesus." &c. Again,—"For we that are in tabernacle (in this body of flesh) do groan, being burdened," &c. With Paul, we are willing to acknowledge ourselves the '*chief* of *sinners.*' And we give all glory to God, who hath *given* us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

1. Tim. vi. "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, the *words of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is *proud, knowing nothing*, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness. From such *withdraw thyself.*"

Note.—The Editor in justice to the Society of Friends, remarks,—that it is confidently believed they would reject the sentiments of Philotheus with abhorrence! The term Quaker, therefore, is used to designate those, who, under a specious garb cherish, and occasionally avow sentiments, which are hostile to Revelation, reason and common sense!

From the London Universalist's Miscellany.

On Sunday, April 6, 1794, being at the New Chapel City Road, I heard Mr. R——— preach from these words. "Verily verily I say unto you, whatsoever you ask the Father in my name, it shall be given you." In the course of his sermon, he observed, that we might rest on these words, in asking for complete deliverance from sin. That we might ask this for ourselves, our acquaintance, and for all mankind. I afterwards asked him, "Sir, if I pray for the salvation of all mankind, shall I receive an answer to my prayer." He replied, "Yes, you know the Apostle exhorts that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men." True, said I; but will not the doctrine of the Restoration follow? After a short pause, he said, "No, what I mean by all men is, all men that are now alive on earth" I asked further, "if I pray for the salvation of all men that are now alive, will my prayer be heard?" He said, "I cannot tell; only God commands us to pray for all men."

NOTICE.

To Distant Subscribers.

Two more Numbers completing the 1st volume of the GOSPEL HERALD, the Editor solicits the attention of Subscribers in *distant towns*, to the following arrangement, which he respectfully requests them to conform to, &c.

It is contemplated for the 2d. volume, to alter its form to that of *Royal Octavo*, 8 pages of 2 columns each, to be printed with a *new Brevier type*, (one size *smaller* than the present type,) and to be issued weekly, as usual. The price in future to be $2, 50 per annum, payable in advance; or on the reception of the *Third* Number, or 3 dollars if paid half yearly, at the expiration of the first six months, and at the completion of the volume. The *first Number* of the 2d volume, will be forwarded to the present distant Subscribers, and the Editor will consider all those as continuing their subscription for the 2d volume, who do not signify, to him, their intention of discontinuing their patronage, *previous* to the issuing the second number. &c.

It is confidently hoped, the reflection, that the only inducement to publishing the GOSPEL HERALD, is a wish to encourage and increase the present spirit of inquiry, which is so happily abroad in the world, after *truth*, and to aid in the establishment of it,—that during the present opposition, which exists in the mind of a great portion of our brethren, to the truth, and to a *free investigation* of it, that the Editor must be satisfied with receiving as a compensation for his labours, the scorn of many of his opponents, and, what is no less certain, the pleasant reflection of having in some small measure, at least so far as assisted by a kind Providence, refuted *error* and established the *truth*, will operate among other inducements with our friends, in distant towns, to continue their support, at least, another year.

The proposed form, of the paper for the future volume, will contain matter, which, were it published in a common *octavo* form, &c. (the usual shape for Theological periodical publications,) would make more than *one thousand* pages.

The Editor, availing himself of this opportunity, tenders his most grateful acknowledgments to all the Patrons of the GOSPEL HERALD, for their countenance and support. And committing, in *unbounded confidence*, their present and future welfare to our Beneficent Father in Heaven, commends *them*, and *all* our brethen, the human race, to His Holy keeping.

NOTICE.

The GOSPEL HERALD, after the *present* week, will be published at the office of Messrs. Hoyt & Bolmore, No. 70 Bowery. Correspondents, therefore, are requested to send their communications to No. 70 Bowery, *Office in the rear*,—up stairs, and the '*letter-box*' will be found immediately within the door, on entering, &c.

To Correspondents———J. C and Q. S. are received.

NOTICE.

Persons wishing to subscribe for this paper, are respectfully requested to call at No. 464 Pearl-Street, where a subscription is open, and where they can obtain the Numbers from the first.

*The signature of Philotheus being in one corner of the margin of his communication, was overlooked, until too late for insertion.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

" FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1821. NO. 51.

Communications.

Controversial.

TIMOTHEUS.

(Continued.)

Since I began this paper, I have seen your Address, delivered before a new society, established for the extension of what you call gospel truth; and I could not but smile to see how you have run into the same error that you so severely condemn in some of the Calvinistic clergy. If God has pre-ordained the happiness of all, as *you* say, or the happiness of a part, and the misery of the rest, as *they* say, what motive can there possibly be for man to make any exertion? Can he change the decrees of God? Can he produce any effect, by endeavouring to oppose or assist them? Can the Predestinarians, with all their money and exertions, compel or persuade him to make any alterations in his decrees, and consign more to hell or to heaven than he originally intended; or to please them, perhaps make a few *exchanges?* Would not the very circumstance of his establishing his decrees long before the creation of this world, prove that they were designed to be above the reach of man, and that God neither wished nor intended to receive any of their prayers, *assistance, advice,* direction, or control? You very justly ridicule them for their folly and inconsistency. But let me ask you, are you not in some respects equally inconsistent, though perhaps less malignant and uncharitable? If God has determined upon the salvation of all, what more can you possibly desire? Do you wish him to save more than all? Have you not abundant reason to be satisfied? And besides, you say man can do nothing, and God has already done every thing that is necessary to be done; and if man endeavours to work righteousness, it is nothing but filthy rags, and must be rejected. And here permit me to ask you why you call on your brethren to unite in spreading what you believe to be the truth? What good can it do? Those who believe it not, are on as safe ground as those who do. You cannot save one soul by your exertions, for the salvation of all, you know, was determined upon long before your *piece of machinery* came into existence. You say, "united we stand, divided we fall." Fall! Mr. Editor, where can you fall? Certainly no where but into heaven: and where else could you possibly wish to go? That is the place, you know, where good and evil, saints and sinners, all must meet. There, those who have repented of their sins, and those who have not; those who love the Lord, and those who do not; those who worship the Lord, and those who worship the devil; the good and the bad, the righteous and the wicked, the sheep and the goats, all, all sit down together in that blessed land of real liberty and equality; that blessed land, where righteousness and wickedness, good and evil, godliness and deviltry are all on a par. In Matt. viii. 11. it is said, many shall come from the east and the west, and sit down in the kingdom of heaven with *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob*: but if your doctrine is true, it ought to be added, with *Judas, Nero,* and the *Devil.*—A heterogeneous mixture indeed, but never mind that, since they are all so happy.

If a man, by vice and crimes, has made himself miserable and wretched here, he has nothing to do but commit murder, be hanged, and go to heaven. Indeed murder would become a virtue, because it would terminate the misery of its victims, and initiate them immediately into everlasting blessedness. In fact, it would appear, upon this principle, as if those whom we call the most vile and criminal, were the peculiar favourites of heaven. For it seems to be, the order of providence, cooperating with the laws of man, that soon after the commission of their crimes they should be removed from this world of sorrow and trouble, to enjoy never-ending felicity above the skies. There they may unceasingly rejoice with all their kindred spirits, and forever unite in chanting forth praises, that they were entitled, by their crimes, through the medium of the gallows, to find the shortest cut to heaven; while the moralizing and repenting Christian is left to draw out a long, and perhaps miserable life in this unsatisfying and imperfect mode of existence. Here you have much the advantage of the Calvinists, for although each one of them is certain of his own election, before he will or can give a full assent to the doctrine, yet he cannot arrive at that desirable certainty respecting the gentry above-mentioned. He does not know but by hurrying them out of this world he may precipitate them into endless misery; for he has no infallible rule to determine whether they belong to the elect or not. I shall now make a few more remarks on the subject of free agency, and draw to a conclusion.

(To be concluded in our next.)

REMARKS.

Timotheus in his sixth paragraph asks, "*If* God has pre-ordained the happiness of *all*, as you say, &c. what motive can there possibly be, for man to make any exertion? Can he change the decrees of God? Can he produce any effect, by endeavouring to oppose or *assist* them?" We answer, no! Timotheus continues—"If God has determined upon the salvation of *all*, what *more* can you possibly desire?" Ans. We desire no more! What follows? Now, admit that God has *not* "determined upon the salvation of *all?*" "What more can *you* possibly desire?" Do you wish to have *more* saved than God has determined *to* save? Or do you believe God never determined to save *any?* Can you "advise, assist, direct, and control" God? Had God any design at all? If so, what is it? Will it be accomplished? These are questions we insist upon your answering, if, as appears to be your present plan, you are determined to let human reason settle the question. For ourselves, we believe that God has a will, purpose, or counsel; and that "his counsel shall stand, and he will do *all* his pleasure." Can you prove to the contrary? We believe in "the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath *purposed* in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together into one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, in him." Do you believe God will do as "he has purposed?" Or will you deny that God ever 'purposed' to do this? Timotheus asks, "Have you not abundant reason to be satisfied?" We answer, Yes! Is there any expression in the Address, denoting *dissatisfaction* on our part, of God? He continues: "And besides, you say *man* can do nothing, and God has already *done* every thing that is necessary to be done." Very true; and will you presume to say God has *not* done every thing that is necessary to be done? If so, do you think man will finish what God has left undone? The Scriptures declare, of Christ, "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world. Behold, I make all things new!" Will this be left *unfinished* by God? and *can,* or will man finish it? Timotheus continues: "And if man endeavours to work righteousness, it is nothing but filthy rags, and must be rejected." We must give him the credit of producing this gratuitously, and accommodating us with it! Now we believe agreeably to the Scriptures, that our works are acceptable to God, in proportion as they are profitable unto man. God wants none of our help—and whenever any man produces his works of righteousness, as a ground of his acceptance with his Maker, to *pay* for endless happiness, they will most assuredly be rejected as "filthy rags." And filthy they are, when put in competition with the righteousness of God in Christ.

Timotheus again interrogates, "And here permit me to ask you, why you call on your brethren to unite in spreading what you believe to be the truth? What good can it do? Those who believe it not, are on as *safe ground* as those who do. You cannot *save one* soul by your exertions; for the salvation of all, you know, was determined upon long before your piece of machinery came into existence." To this we answer: First, Because it is the truth! Second, It will do good to those who believe it, for it will give them peace in believing; agreeably to the apostle, "We who have believed do enter into *rest.*" Third, if those who do *not* believe it are on as *safe* ground as those who *do,* they do not *know* it, and suffer as much in their apprehension, as though they were in imminent *danger!* Now, we, knowing their *safety,* and pitying their apprehension, wish to relieve them. Therefore, we tell them "the truth—the gospel of *their* salvation." Fourth, We are sensible *we* cannot save our souls; and we likewise know that no other of the human race can: God alone *can* save, and has saved; and we wish to convince our brethren, all men, of this truth, and induce them to trust in God, and *not* man!

Fifth—We know, and we tell Timotheus, that he cannot disprove it, that God determined to save *all,* even before our "piece of machinery came into existence." And we farther tell him, that if this were not the case, except God were a *changeable* Being, he never would be saved, but would be destroyed, with all the machines that ever did come into existence.

Timotheus continues, "You say, United we stand, divided we fall: fall! Mr. Editor, where can you fall?" We answer, into *mischief!* into the "*broken cisterns,*" which the Arminians are continually "hewing out," and placing in our way, that we may stumble.

Timotheus remarks, "Certainly no where but into *heaven.* And where else could you possibly wish to go?" Do the Scriptures represent men as tumbling into heaven? Are rising and falling synonymous terms? Timotheus is disposed to be pleasant. He had a reason for this. He has tried other means, and failed; and now would obtain by dint of humour, what he ineffectually attempted to gain by argument and the Scriptures. Now the Scriptures represent men to be in danger, from the deceitfulness of sin, of falling from the truth; and giving heed to "cunningly devised fables." And we know of none more "cunningly devised" than the Arminian, which attempts to reconcile man to a disposition to question the merciful goodness of his heavenly Father, and undervalue the atonement of Christ, by flattering his vanity with tales of his *own* goodness, and the wonderful things he can do; which will exalt him so far above the heads of his wicked neighbours, that he shall be crowned for a saint, while they are condemned as devils!

Timotheus remarks, (of heaven) "That is the place, *you know,* where good and *evil,* saints and sinners, all must meet." If we know this now, it is more than we knew before. We think Timotheus is, in his opinion, if he has any opinion the fruit of sober reflection, condemned for this indirect and unjust accusation! Let him produce from the Address, or the columns of this paper, (his own productions excepted,) a declaration to this effect. He must acknowledge himself to *be* a sinner, and *evil!* Does he expect to go to heaven *in* his sins? If so, we tell him he is mistaken. And if he ever arrives at heaven divested of *his* sins, he will be indebted to Christ *alone,* for taking them away! He can now solve the difficulty for himself, and for others; even for *us,* whom he would insidiously represent as advocating such abominable principles.

He continues, "Then those who have repented of their sins, and those who have *not;* those who love the Lord, and those who do not; those who worship the Lord, and those who worship the *devil;* the good and the *bad,* the righteous and the *wicked,* the sheep and the goats, all, all sit down together in that land of real liberty and equality." The reader will please to notice, that Timotheus has the exclusive *honour* of these, apparently to him, precious sentiments. He has not produced any evidence to prove that any believer in the universal goodness of our heavenly Father, ever uttered them. And it appears, that he has not been able to muster courage sufficient to charge them to any person whatever. Consequently, the reader is left to conjecture, whether his motive is not, first, to broach *his* own sentiments, and afterwards, if he pleases, to confess them!

Timotheus continues, "In Matt. viii. 11. it is said, Many shall come from the east and the west, and sit down in the kingdom of heaven with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but if *your doctrine is true,* it ought to be added, with Judas, Nero, and the *devil.* A heterogeneous mixture indeed; but never mind that, since they are all so happy." We inform Timotheus, that in Matt. v. 11, it is said, "Blessed are ye when *men* shall *revile* you, and persecute *you,* (God in his good providence protects us from persecution, in a very great measure, by the arm of the secular power,) and shall say all manner of *evil* against you *falsely* for my sake."* See Jude 16 v. "These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling *words,* having *men's* persons in admiration, because of advantage." If Timotheus has "read with attention our remarks," as he says he has, he has read, that according to *our doctrine,* the devil will be *destroyed,* not go

*The reader is requested to turn to Number 17, page 68.

to *heaven!* And that our doctrine teaches, that the "righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ, is *unto* all, and *upon* all them that believe, for there is *no difference*, for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," Rom. iii. That the righteousness of God, which would make him holy, and fit for heaven, would fit Nero! For "he that offends in *one* point, is guilty of *all!*" And if he has read his Bible 'attentively,' he must have read, that "Christ ascended up on high, leading captivity captive, and obtaining *gifts* for men, even for the *rebellious*, that God the Lord might dwell with them." Again, that "God will put his laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts; and *will* be to them a God, and they shall be to him a people, &c.—For I *will* be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." This is *our* doctrine, and Timotheus knows it to be such. According to this, our doctrine, Nero, or the *worst* man who ever lived, or shall live, will be far more *fit* for heaven, washed with the Redeemer's blood, and clothed in the righteousness of *God*, than Timotheus would be, if, in addition to all his *own* righteousness, he had a fee simple in all the "filthy rags" of all the pharisees who ever existed!!! We *pity* the man, who can come forward and expose, without blushing, his own depravity, in the glaring manner Timotheus has done. We advise him, for the future, unless he can produce something better than *raving* and *railing*, to remain silent. For we assure him, that his reputation for *candour* of construction, and ability in argument, will suffer much more than our doctrine by his impotent attempts to destroy it. When he learns the difference between *calling* hard names, and justifying by evidence his application of them, he may stand some chance of doing a little better.

But Timotheus continues, "If a man by vice and crimes has made himself *miserable* and wretched here, he has nothing to do but commit *murder*, be hanged, and go to heaven. Indeed, murder would become a virtue, because it would terminate the misery of its victims, and initiate them immediately into everlasting blessedness." Let us examine this way of *making virtue!* Timotheus has a child suffering pain and sickness; he believes all young children go "immediately to heaven," &c. Now if Timotheus should *murder his* child, "indeed murder would become a *virtue*, because it would terminate the misery of its victim, and initiate it immediately into everlasting blessedness!!!" How do you like the conclusion to your *own premisses?* What would be virtue in another, would be virtue in *you!* And if a man has a licence to kill himself, he has to kill his child. You would kill your child as soon as you would kill yourself; and you would do neither, were you in possession of your reason. Timotheus is obliged to produce an *insane* man, destitute of reason, to sit for his picture. We think he is conducting in character. Having, himself, first outraged every rational principle, he was obliged to have recourse to the lunatic hospital for assistance. Common sense, when a man gets to such a pitch, is altogether useless. Extraordinary means are resorted to, and we appeal to the reader, whether an extraordinary (and we think to Timotheus an unexpected) result has not been the consequence! We shall produce a case in point: the crucifixion of Christ has, by all religious sects, been acknowledged to be an event pregnant with incalculable good to mankind. Now if the *end justifies* the means, the Jews who crucified Christ, according to Timotheus, had more *virtue* than all the rest of mankind put together!

According to Timotheus, the man who is so *miserable* as to find life insupportable, is the "peculiar favourite of heaven." Now if this is true, in the sense he would have it, those who are miserable (according to his opinion) in hell eternally, are wonderfully blessed! We shall shortly see his consistency in a more clear and shining light! He continues, "For it seems to be the laws of providence, co-operating with the laws of man, that soon after the commission of their crimes (Quere. be *punished!!!*) they should be removed from this world of sorrow and trouble, to enjoy never-ending felicity above the skies. There they may unceasingly rejoice with all their kindred spirits, and for ever unite in chanting forth praises, that they were entitled by their *crimes*, through the medium of the *gallows*, to find the shortest cut to heaven; while the *moralizing* and repenting Christian is left to draw out a long, and perhaps a *miserable* life in this *unsatisfying* and imperfect mode of existence." It is a fine thing to be consistent! And we think this must be a very "unsatisfying and imperfect mode of existence," when even the "repenting *moralizing Christian*," and the "man of *vice* and *crimes*," are alike 'miserable.' We believe that the occasion of the Christian's misery, as mentioned by Timotheus, must proceed from "*moralizing*," as he has done in his communication; and we shall be very much mistaken, if he, before he gets clear of it, if he does not absolutely think of "*hanging*," will feel a little different from those, who are any thing like being happy? Timotheus ought to reconcile the difficulty which is apparent on the very face of his *logic*. How does it happen, that your good and bad men are all miserable together? Have you effects without *causes?* or *causes* without effects? Depend upon it, if you do not watch your "moralizing, repenting, miserable, Christians," they will all *hang together?* The Scriptures declare that Christ is the way! Where did you derive authority for saying that the *gallows* is the way! The Scriptures likewise declare, that they who "have believed do enter into *rest.*" Your "moralizing Christians," must be *unbelievers*, or they would not "draw out their miserable lives." Depend upon it, you have made a mistake—see to it, and no longer introduce characters, as examples, who, according to your own descriptions, are in great danger of seeking salvation by the gallows, or the halter, driven by their miserable ignorance and morality from vice to *virtue*, and from the gallows to your imaginary heaven!

(Concluded next week.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

I gratefully express my satisfaction to the Editor for the clemency manifested in his reply to my first essay; and hope I shall not demerit a discontinuance of it; for I know that self-love is greatly gratified with a kind, respectful, and equitable treatment. *Boreas*, by his blustering violence, could not force the cloak from the traveller; but *Sol*, by his bright, mild, and melting influence, compelled him to take off his cloak.

I am pleased to find, by the Editor's second paragraph, that we agree in believing the Holy Spirit is the only true interpreter of the word of the Lord. N. B. The Editor has in this paragraph made me sensible of carelessness in expressing my sentiments; and the readers are desired to correct a mistake in my second paragraph, by prefixing the word *Calvinistic*, before "election of a few, and damnation of millions," and an &c. at the end of the period.

The Editor says of my fourth paragraph, that "it refutes itself; and that the intelligent reader will see this without showing." Do not pass by the best paragraph in my essay in this way. This is a method too easy in getting rid of an argument proving free agency too clearly to be refuted. It proves that if men (while living in, and according to, the flesh) sin, (and the Scriptures prove this) men must be free agents; for none but free agents can sin. Intelligent readers will see that the Editor, and not Reprehensor, is deficient: the latter does not confute *free agency*, as the former asserted; and which is older than the Editor, for it existed in Adam. N. B. I did not use the word *agent* to signify a *factor*, who does business for another; but I used it in the sense which philosophers have used it, to signify a being *acting on another being*, which they termed the patient. I mention this that I may not be misapprehended. By the epithet *free* prefixed to *agent*, I mean power to do or omit our duty to God, our neighbour, or ourselves. The Lord's servant is therefore a free man, and free agent, 1 Cor. vii. 22. Convince me that men never, since the lapse of Adam and Eve, had the power of doing or omitting to do right and wrong, and I shall then be convinced that men have no freedom of will to choose, nor free agency to act, or to do good or harm, so as to deserve civil or spiritual recompense, or punishment. Then I shall believe that no man, since the fall of our first parents, ever sinned; for a being, necessarily forced by fate, and without free agency, cannot be judged, cannot commit sin, nor do good, so as to deserve blame or praise, chastisement or reward. Then I shall believe the Scriptures of truth are untrue, where they record the sins of men and nations, committed from the days of Cain to those of Judas the traitor. Nay, I must then believe there never was a sin committed since the apostacy of Adam. But I see too much wickedness in the world ever to believe these things; and therefore, I call the Editor's attention to my fourth paragraph, which *does not refute itself;* though I endeavoured to assist the Editor all I could, by calling to his aid the pre-existence of souls, which is one of *his* doctrines, not *mine*.

The Editor does not seem to be pleased that Paul uses the present tense, where he says, "As in Adam all die," that is, all now die, &c. He quoted me incorrectly in his third paragraph, for he left out my explanation, "all died;" and this, and not Paul's words, was what I granted for the sake of argument. My courtesy was to the Editor, and not to St. Paul, or sinner Paul, if the Editor prefers the latter epithet.

Create and *creation*. To *create* is a word which is explained to mean "to cause to exist what did not exist." The Editor mistook my sixth paragraph, which is intended to prove that all things were not created 6000 years ago, or less, according to common opinion. I gain my point, and prove my postulate, by proving that creation has continued down to the present day; and what I did not, has been kindly done for me by the Editor; who says, that *create* is used for renew, gather, regenerate, make, form, mould, build up, restore, &c. Hence he evidently grants, that creation is continually progressing; and that all things were created six thousand years ago or less. Hence souls need not to pre-exist; they may be created or produced daily. I am glad we are herein agreed as to words, and hope he will by and by agree with me as to sentiment, and acknowledge my proposition.

Does the Editor believe we *have been*, or *now are*, in Adam? For all were or are, somehow in him, when they died, or die in him. And I wish to know how and when it was; or when it is that we sin, or have sinned in him? If the Presbyterians are correct, we rationally suppose that octillions of beings were in Adam, and sinned in him in his first trangression. How exceedingly minute must such existencies have been to have occupied the body or soul of Adam!!! And did they all then die in Adam? and were they damned and miserable till the coming of Christ in the flesh? Be kindly explicit on this topic, for I desire to understand the subject *rightly*. Perhaps I have erred in considering the Rellyans *Calvinistic* in their ideas of the manner of salvation, though they believe none are lost: some Universalists being Arminian in their sentiments of redemption, but the Rellyan Universalists, I believe are not.

The Editor says, "If Aaron had produced lice without the dust, we should make no objection to his [Reprehensor's] making use of the word *creation.*" Hence I infer, that whatever was *formed* of *dust* and *ground*, during the six days creation, (provided the Editor is correct) were not created. Adam was made of dust, and every beast of the field was formed of the ground: consequently they were, (agreeably with the Editor's ideas) never created. Nor was Eve created from Adam's rib. Thus the Editor seems to deny creation, unless *something is made out of nothing.* But this denial is untrue. Moses declares that *man was created:* Adam being made of the dust, and Eve formed of Adam's rib; which proves they were created of something, as well as the lice, which were created by the power of God to afflict Egypt. These were not *my* lice, as the Editor asserted. He might have thought that *I*, in my pre-existent state, produced them. If so, his mistake should be excused, his reflection to the contrary notwithstanding. What I said of the pre-existence of all

oaks in the first created oaks; all grasses in the first made grasses; all animalcules and elephants in the first of their order, from which they were produced, was intended to show the folly and absurdity of the doctrine of the pre-existence of all animals and vegetables in their primeval parents; and at the same time to prove that the Calvinistic doctrine of Presbyterians and Rellyans, who believe that all souls were made *with*, and pre-existed *in*, Adam, sinning in him, and falling in him, in his first transgression, is a doctrine equally preposterous and ridiculous.

They who suppose that all souls were created on the sixth day of creation, must believe, either thall all souls were created in Adam, or out of, i. e. separate from Adam. I have presumed, till otherwise informed, that Calvinists, whether Presbyterians or Rellyans, believed the first idea, that all were created *in Adam*. I have exhibited the folly and absurdity of this creed. But if the Editor chooses the second opinion, that all were created *out of*, i. e. *separate from*, Adam, I answer, that all souls could not, (as not being in Adam) sin, die, or be damned in him. Where then have these sinful and damned souls been for 4000 years, or until Jesus Christ came into the world, and drew them all unto (or into) him, regenerating, resuscitating, and making them sit with him in heavenly places? It behooves the Editor to obviate these difficulties, or we shall believe his doctrines, relative to these things, to be fancifully false.

REPREHENSOR.

(To be concluded in our next.)

REMARKS.

Our correspondent's first and second paragraphs not requiring any answer, we pass to his third. We inform him that the reason assigned for neglecting the fourth paragraph, in his first communication, was, as assigned; and not to evade the force of any argument which may be supposed to be contained it. Reprehensor, however, being of a contrary opinion, and believing there is an argument *in* it, we shall try, and if possible find it. We remarked, at the time, that it "refuted itself." If we were wrong in making this assertion, we shall endeavour to make amends now, and confute it *ourselves*.

The reader, by turning to No. 39, p. 157, will find in this *fourth* paragraph, an acknowledgment that we can prove all men to be sinners by the fact of the pre-existence of the soul. This doctrine, Reprehensor has not only failed of confuting, but he even declines answering in form the testimonies we have adduced from the Scriptures in support of it. This one circumstance, independent of any other consideration, is more than sufficient to justify our phraseology. For if our position is true, and he cannot obviate it, the contradiction of his fourth paragraph is apparent. Reprehensor, however, shall stand or fall on his *own* premisses and positions. He says, a "maniac cannot be justly accountable for sin, because his intellect is *deranged* to such a degree, that he is irrational, and incapable of *free-agency*. He is mentally forced and diseased." Speaking of Adam, he says, "he *died* to *all* good from above, to live in *all evil* below, &c. Hence the *origin* of sin is properly derived from a free-agent's transgression of the law of God. If, therefore, God had never created a free-agent, sin could *never* have come into existence; for none but free-agents ever did, or ever can, criminally and penally commit sin." There is but one remedy for Reprehensor, and that is, to prop himself up with that "leg of our tripod," which he calls "pre-existence of souls." "None but a free-agent *can* sin; Adam *was* a free-agent, and died (in consequence of sinning) to *all good*." We ask, If Adam *was* a free-agent *before* he sinned, what was he *after* he had sinned? If none but a free-agent *can* sin, how could Adam sin *after* "he had died to all good?" If this is not a contradiction, which amounts to a complete refutation of the modern doctrine of free-agency, we do not know what could amount to it. Take Reprehensor's own reasoning and concessions—"The maniac is not accountable," Why? "Because his *will* and intellect are *deranged*," &c. How much? Is it more deranged than Adam's? "Adam died to *all good!*" Is the maniac deranged to that degree, that he is *more* than dead to *all* rationality? Prove this, and then you shall be heard; and until you do it, admit the truth of our declaration, that your "fourth paragraph *refutes itself!*" Answer us, Does free-agency consist in a man's being *dead to all good?* If so, Adam was *not* a free-agent, until *he* "died to *all* good!" If free-agency consists in man's being *alive* to *all* good, then Adam *before* his fall, and when he was alive to *all* good, was a free-agent! But one or the other of these positions must be dispensed with; and until Reprehensor, with the help of a leg of *our* tripod, can stand up, and speak for himself, we shall dismiss this celebrated *fourth paragraph*.

Reprehensor, in his third paragraph, likewise remarks, "I did not use the word *agent* to signify *factor*, who does business for *another;* but used it in the sense which philosophers have used it, to signify a *being* acting on *another* being, which they termed the patient." This, is, perhaps, in the opinion of some, an excellent definition. Pray, can one being act on another being, and the being acted upon not be the factor for the first? This we shall leave for Reprehensor's leisure!

Reprehensor continues—"By the epithet *free*, prefixed to agent, *I mean* power to do, or omit our duty to God, our neighbour, and ourselves." Supposing we were to say, that by *white*, we meant all cloths of *dark* colours, such as *blue* and *black?* would this accommodation on our part, justify the application of the term? We think not. Introducing words of equivocal meaning, or having a gratuitous meaning for words, which, like an *extra* garment you can slip on or off, whenever circumstances make it necessary, may, for aught we know, be very useful and *convenient* for our Arminian friends; but we shall attempt, at least, to put a stop to it. We shall take the liberty to understand the epithet *free*, prefix it to what you will, and tell whatever you please about what *you mean* by it, we shall *make* it mean just what it *does mean*, without any favour or accommodation to any person whatever. Namely, "FREE, s. At *liberty—uncompelled—unrestrained—permitted*," &c. vide Walk. Dict. We think our Correspondents have trifled long enough. In a game at marbles or ball with children, this conduct might answer; but the subjects discussed in this paper are too momentous to be trifled with, by the introduction of a phraseology which will twist and turn, Proteus like, and be made to answer all purposes but a *good* one. Reprehensor, instead of even attempting to answer our interrogatories, or admitting, in any shape whatever, our quotations from the Scriptures to mean any thing, goes on with evidence from his own head, as though he had authority to settle questions, although the Scriptures should imply and declare a contrary doctrine. He remarks—"The Lord's servant is therefore (*Qu.* Wherefore?) a free man, and *free-agent*, 1 Cor. vii. 22." We shall take the liberty to quote this in full, with its connexion. Ver. 21, 22, and 23. "Art thou called, *being* a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be free, use *it* rather. For he that is called in the Lord, *being* a servant, is the Lord's free man: likewise also he that is called, *being* free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men." Comment here is unnecessary!

In reply to the remainder of his third paragraph, we remark, that we shall oppose the Scriptures to his opinions, and let the reader decide, which is deserving of the most credit. Rom. viii. 20. "For the creature (*creation*) was made subject to vanity," &c. see ver. 21. "Because the creature itself also shall be delivered," &c. Isa. xlii. 16. "And *I will* bring the blind by a way they *knew not;* I will lead them in paths *they have not known:* I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight—These things *will I do unto them*, and not forsake them." Reprehensor, as usual, may call this Rellyanism. Confute it he cannot! Look at this again—"By the epithet *free* prefixed to agent, I mean *power* to do," &c. The Scriptures declare, "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib, but my people do not know, they do not consider," &c. "By *free* I mean *power*," &c. Who has the best claim to free-agency, the '*ox* and the *ass*,' or the people who *do not know?* "By *free* I mean *power*," &c. A man has power to burn the city of New-York; but can he do it *freely?* Is he 'permitted,' is he at 'liberty' to do it? Is he 'unrestrained?' "Convince me," says Reprehensor, "that man, never since the lapse of Adam and Eve, had the *power* of doing or omitting to do right and wrong, and I shall then be convinced that men have no freedom," &c. Now we contend, that every beast of the field, and domestic animals, have the power of doing mischief. If doing mischief makes a creature a free-agent, Reprehensor can accommodate his sentiments to a very extensive application. That *man* has not the power, of himself, to do any thing which is *spiritually* good, and which will atone for his sins, and render him more acceptable to God, take the following; John iii. 27. xv. 5. "A man can receive nothing, except it be *given him* from heaven. Without me ye can do nothing." Eph. ii. 8, 9. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that *not* of yourselves; it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast." Man's agency, therefore, call it by what name you please, is not the Saviour.

Reprehensor, in his fourth paragraph, says, "The Editor does not seem to be pleased that Paul uses the *present* tense, where he says, 'As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The Editor is very willing to let Paul settle this matter. Rom. v. "Death passed upon *all* men, (in the *past* tense) for that *all have* (in the *past* tense) sinned." Again, viii. 20. "For the creature (κτισις, *creation*) *was* (in the *past* tense) made subject to vanity," &c.

Reprehensor, by recurring to his first communication, will read, "As in Adam all die, &c. is a *text* quoted to confirm this. Granting this to be *true*." What! the text quoted! We think no courtesy was granted to the Editor. Paul would not ask it, with a qualification.

Reprehensor in his fifth paragraph, tenders his *own* assertion in evidence. Our kindly proving for him, &c. is questionable. The reader will give him as much credit for this subterfuge as he *deserves!* Let him stick to his concession, that *create*, in the passages quoted, is used as a convertible term for *renew*, *gather*, *regenerate*, &c. and he is more than welcome to all the advantage he can obtain from it.

In answer to his sixth paragraph, we remark, Adam and Christ being placed parallel, and in op-

position, the one to the other, and the word *all* used in both cases, and *all* men being members of the body of Christ, and crucified with him, &c. is, if Reprehensor will take the Scriptures in evidence, a sufficient exposition. Reprehensor so frequently making use of the term *Rellyans*, it is presumed he uses it to designate us, &c. We have been called a great many hard names; and this term, not conveying any obloquy, it may, by some, be supposed we ought not to object to answering to it, &c. We, however, inform him, that it is something new; and he might as well call us by any of the many names which are used to designate the political parties in the state, as by this. We know no sect nor party. Christ alone is our only Head! When we teach a *different* doctrine from that which he taught, call us by as many hard names as you please. We shall shortly, if we have opportunity, prove, that our faith, and the faith of John Calvin and his disciples, are as different, and as distant too, as *heaven* is different and distant from *hell!* We believe *all were* lost; and that Christ came to *seek* and to *save* that which *was lost*. It is unnecessary to add, that we believe He was *able* and *willing* to effect his purpose.

Of Reprehensor's seventh and eighth paragraphs, we remark, we have never contended that all, or any part of the souls of the human race were *created* in Adam out of nothing. Reprehensor, instead of answering our interrogatories, or noticing the passages we quoted in support of our faith, has spun out, with repetitions of his former asseverations, a long communication. The reader will give him credit for his address in *evasion!* Let him come forward, and answer us with candour! We answered to him, and examined the passages he quoted. Is asking questions the way to answer questions? It is a very easy thing for a "*free-agent*" to write on two or three sheets of paper, and, according to *his* definition of the term, it ought to be easy for him to answer to all interrogatories, and explain all passages to suit his purpose, which are introduced by another!

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

I find myself again compelled, I hope for the last time, to notice the Editor's unfairness.

He says he has looked into his dictionary, without increasing his wisdom. I believe him. By his own confession he chose, originally, to consult his *own fancy*, rather than *my meaning:* this is what I complain of. A fair opponent would not have done this. If he can justify himself to his readers by this excuse, they will indulge him, I think, beyond his deserts.

The Editor says he is willing to correct misrepresentations when they are pointed out. And he says this too in the face of the following. On looking into his dictionary, he found these definitions of the word "*Yield*,"—"to concede, to admit, to allow, &c. Vide Wal. Dict." My dictionary goes a little further. If his did not, he chose a bad authority. "*Yield*,"—to allow, to concede, to grant, *to resign, to give up, to surrender.*" Vide Johnson.

I must confess, I have always understood, the reader, especially if he was going to answer a writer, was bound to consult the writer's meaning, and not his *own fancy*, in his construction of his meaning. The Editor thinks otherwise.

As another instance of the Editor's misrepresentation, I am bound to notice the following, which I hope he will correct.

He has quoted a sentence to show, from what he inferred as an opinion of mine, that God could not be omnipotent unless man was a voluntary agent. I said that Omnipotence itself could not change the nature of a voluntary agent, *without violating his freedom.* And as God always regards man's freedom and *rationality*, (a word not understood by the Editor,) therefore he cannot communicate to him the blessings of eternal and everlasting life, unless man *consent* to receive them, and *that* by acts of preparation on his part, or putting *himself* in a state to receive them.

The reader will see how easily this way of disputing may be prolonged, until it becomes troublesome. I therefore here repeat my former observation, that I shall not hereafter notice these misrepresentations, but trust to the good sense and candour of the reader, to judge between the Editor and myself. J. C.

ANSWER.

We think J. C. is for once *mistaken;* and the cheapest way for him is to *acknowledge* it! The reader, by looking at our remarks in Nos. 49 and 50, will, we believe, think so too.

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

"Say among the heathen, the LORD reigneth: the world also shall be established that it shall not be moved. He shall *judge* the people righteously. Let the heavens *rejoice*, and let the earth be *glad;* the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be *joyful*, and *all* that *is* therein; then shall *all* the trees *rejoice* before the LORD: (What for? why all this rejoicing? Is it because *those* who are called upon to *rejoice* are going to be consigned to *endless torments?* to everlasting *burnings?* Are endless torments before the Lord? Is his presence misery? No! "Let the heavens *rejoice*, and let the earth be glad,") for *He cometh*, for He cometh to *judge* the earth; He shall *judge* the world with righteousness, and the people with truth." Psa. xcvi.—We say, Amen. Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly. Hallelujah!!!

"And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to *judge* the world, but to *save* the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath *one* that *judgeth* him; the *word* that I have spoken, the *same* shall *judge* him in the *last day.* For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a *commandment* what I should say, and what I should speak. And I *know* that his *commandment* is *life* everlasting." John xii.

Christ came to *save* the world, (*kosmon*, the creation which is in the bondage of corruption; all men, not a part.) Did he effect his purpose? Paul says, "We see not yet all things put under him, but we see Jesus," &c. We do not now behold the work completed in a visible manner before our eyes, and all men reconciled. But we see Jesus, &c. The means to effect the end are used. We have faith to believe in the final "restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of *all his holy* prophets, since the world began. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The *last* enemy shall be destroyed—*death.*"

"*They that know thy Name will put their trust in thee.*" DAVID.

That knowledge must precede faith, is a position which must be acceded to by every man who is in the quiet possession of common sense. The contrary position, that a man is required to believe a thing, or principle, of which he is ignorant, is too absurd and shocking to every rational conception, to merit a serious refutation. There are those, however, who in their opinion, at least, have great pretensions to rationality and wisdom, who not only pretend themselves to believe, but actually require others to give a blind assent to positions, of which they are more ignorant than the ox and the ass, of those things which come within their capacity, and are comprehended by them. The reader's observation will render any particular evidence here unnecessary.

The declaration of the prophet is true, and deserves consideration in preference to the dogmas of all sectarians put together. The Scriptures declare that "God is Love,"—that He is "Our Father;" and God proclaims himself to be "the LORD, the LORD God, gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abundant in goodness," &c. Is it possible for any man to *know* God as his Father, who loves him, and who is gracious and merciful towards him, without putting his trust in God? We think not. On the other hand, is it possible for any man to put his trust in God, whose *ignorance* is so great, as to suppose God is his *enemy;* and instead of loving, *hates* him; that he is not gracious, nor merciful; and instead of being his Father, and *abundant* in goodness, is his *foe*, and sparing of his mercy, but abundant in his vengeance? We think not.

A man would be quite as consistent, who should throw himself into a house which was wrapped in flames, in a hot summer's day, to cool himself, as that man, who should *trust* in a being whom he had every reason to believe would make him endlessly miserable! No man, therefore, who is ignorant of God can trust in him; and no man who knows God, can help trusting in him. He may lose his knowledge, and then he will be deprived of his confidence, as a consequence; but while his knowledge remains he will trust in God, with all the confidence a child would repose in the most affectionate parent.

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

"Now unto Him that is *able* to do *exceeding* abundantly *above* all that we *can ask* or *think*, &c. unto Him be glory, &c. Eph. iii. 20. Reader, how much can you *ask*, and *think?* Can you *ask* for the happiness of *all* men in heaven? Can you *think* that it is possible for God to save *all* men *from* their sins, (not *in* them,) and make them happy? God "is able to do exceeding abundantly *above* all this." What do you think? Will He do it?

When the apostle says, that "*God is able to do*," &c. does he mean that "God *cannot*" except man will condescend to let him? What do you think? *We* think, that God's goodness is *equal* to his power, and His wisdom is equal to his goodness, and that He *will do all* that He has promised! What do *you* think?

WISDOM IS BETTER THAN RUBIES.

At least, so says the wise man, and we think he told the truth. We recently received a letter from a friend, in a distant town, requesting the Gospel Herald forwarded to him, &c. He concludes, by saying, that he "hopes we shall not disappoint a sincere inquirer after truth; an old Revolutionary Soldier, who has had great anxiety of mind, through the various discussions of Calvinism and Hopkinsianism," &c. Now we believe our venerable correspondent, would, if appealed to, acknowledge, that the sufferings in Calvin's and Hopkin' camp, were no less grievous, and *much less* satisfactory than the hardships endured in the camp of the "immortal WASHINGTON!"

NOTICE.

Since publishing our Proposals for the Second Volume of the Gospel Herald, it has been suggested to us by a number of our friends, that during the present exigencies of the times, the payment of a year's subscription in *advance*, would to some be an inconvenience; and that in some cases, half-yearly and quarterly payments would be an accommodation, &c. The Editor, if his circumstances would justify it, would be gratified to supply, even *gratis*, those whose circumstances subject them to any inconvenience by the payment of their subscription. And, although the conditions of the PROPOSALS generally must be complied with, by those whose circumstances authorize it, to enable the Editor to prosecute the work with any convenience to himself, still, every indulgence will be afforded which the peculiar circumstances of our friends may require.

To Correspondents.

Our friends in Connecticut are informed, that we shall not delay noticing the Rev. Mr. HAIGHT'S SERMON, after the publication of our First Number, Second Volume, &c.

Edward Sharman, C., Savin, and Impartialist, are received.

N. B. Correspondents will find the Letter-Box at the left side of the door on entering the Printing-Office.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

HOYT & BOLMORE, PRINTERS, 70 BOWERY.

THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 14, 1821. NO. 52.

Communications.

Controversial.

TIMOTHEUS.

(Concluded.)

Would God call upon mankind every where to repent, if he had not given them the power? Would he tell them to love him, and one another, and to keep his commands, when he knew they they had no power? Would he set life and death before them, and tell them to make a choice, when he knew they were not free agents, and of course had no power of choosing? Is it possible that you can suppose a Being who is infinitely good and wise, should act in a manner so inconsistent? Poor weak man does not conduct himself so preposterously; for if he has a piece of machinery, he does not talk, threaten, persuade and argue with it as if it was a rational being, but makes use of superior force and puts it in motion.

In answer to a former communication of mine, you asserted that Christ, when on earth, performed all that was necessary for the salvation of sinners; and also that all were saved in him eighteen hundred years ago. Here you place the character of God in a still more inconsistent point of view: for he not only calls upon man to do, what he knows he has no power of doing, but also what is already done. But your premisses are wrong; for there is one thing, which I believe even you will allow to be absolutely necessary for the salvation of sinners, which our Saviour did not do when he was on earth; nay, more, which he never can do for them. And that is repentance. He says, 'he did not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.' Please to observe, he does not say, that he did or will repent for them. No, this would be impossible; for repentance signifies, a sorrow for sin, and turning from it, by the person who has committed it. There is no such thing, nor ever was, or can be, as that one person should repent for another. Our Lord had committed no sin, and therefore could not repent, neither was he man that he should repent.

I do not contend that man of himself alone, without any assistance from God, can work out his own salvation, but I do contend that there is much for him to do. Would you say to the farmer, because he cannot make his wheat grow, that there is nothing for him to do? That if God has foreordained a crop, he will have it, and therefore all his exertions are good for nothing. Do you believe that the farmer who should act upon this principle, would have a crop of wheat? Would you not rather say to him, remove all obstructions from your ground, prepare the soil, sow the seed, and trust to providence for the crop? Might you not with equal propriety say to the sinner, examine yourself faithfully, search your spiritual field, and see what obstructions you find, and by divine assistance endeavour to remove them; prepare the soil; search the word of God for the divine seed which is to be implanted in your soul, and pray constantly to the Lord to bless your labours, and give you the increase. Such advice, however reasonable it may appear, would be entirely lost upon any being or thing which is not a free agent. Wishing you happiness here, and eternal happiness hereafter, I subscribe myself sincerely your friend. TIMOTHEUS.

ANSWER.

Timotheus commences his eighth paragraph with the following interrogation—"Would God call upon mankind every where to repent, if he had not given them the power?" We freely acknowledge that mankind have power, if they would use it properly, to abstain from many evils which they do not refrain from. And did mankind *know*, that a contrary conduct from that which they so blindly pursue, would make them happier than they are at present, they would unquestionably conduct better! We define repentance to be a *turning* from, &c. it is the *effect* of a cause; the cause is knowledge. Convince a thief that he will find greater enjoyment in *honest* pursuits than in *stealing*, and he will *repent*, turn from his thievish practices, and be honest from the *same* motive he was dishonest, namely, a desire to increase his enjoyments. We go farther—we believe God has given evidence of his goodness to mankind in *nature*, (to say nothing of the Scriptures,) which agreeing with reason, man is therefore inexcusable for his ignorance in a measure; for he daily outrages evidence in favour of the goodness, and consequent demands for his gratitude from his Maker, which he would receive in the common transactions of life; and blame others for not receiving testimony of equal or inferior authority, to that which he is continually rejecting himself. Timotheus is requested to consider his declaration, as follows—"But your premisses are *wrong;* for there is *one* thing, which I believe, even you will allow to be absolutely necessary for the salvation of sinners, which our Saviour did not do when he was on earth, nay, more, which he can never do for them; and that is, *repentance.* (Quere. Did he not *turn from* every evil way?) He says, 'I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance?' Please to observe, he does not say that he did, or will repent for them; no! this would be impossible, for repentance signifies a sorrow for sin, and a *turning from* it, by the person who has committed it." Now we can inform Timotheus of something which is a great deal *better* than his repentance. It is to have *no sins* to repent of! Christ came to save mankind '*from their sins.*' The repentance Timotheus speaks of, however necessary and proper it may be, is, compared with this, but *sorry business!* The question now presents itself—Cannot God save sinners without *their* help? without *their* repentance? We say yes, he can, he has done it! Paul tells the Ephesians, speaking of Christ, "In whom ye also *trusted*, AFTER that ye heard the *word of truth*, (what was that word of *truth?* Ans.) the gospel (news) of *your salvation.*" Now if the Ephesians had repented *before* they were saved, which, according to Timotheus, is necessary, Paul should have told them, "In whom *after* ye *trusted*, ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation." But the word of truth *was* the gospel (*Euaggelion*, news,) of their salvation. The word of *truth* was true *before* they heard it! It was as much a truth that they *were* the saved of the Lord, when they were in *ignorance* and idolatry, bowing to idols, as "*after* they heard it," &c. There is not a plainer declaration of any fact, in any language; neither can there be. What is the consequence? Ans. Repentance is not a *cause*, but an *effect* of salvation. Salvation of sinners in Christ, is the word of *truth*—sinners hear it, believe it, and turn from their sins, to God. And this is as consistent with reason, as it is agreeable to the Scriptures. There must be an incentive to *action*. Trusting in God, and refraining from sin, are two things. And although the man who trusts in God will refrain from sin, as a consequence, he is moved by a more exalted motive than him, who merely refrains from sinning to avoid the consequences, and escape the punishment! *Gratitude* is the incentive to action! He would be *ashamed* to have his conscience even *whisper* the accusation of the base and grovelling motive, of *loving* the sin, and *fearing* the *punishment!!!* Here is an answer, in full, to the false accusations, and slanderous reports of an unbelieving world. Here are Scripture and reason, hand in hand, taking sides in favour of the universal goodness of our heavenly Father. The old objection is growing stale. It is folly, any longer, to pretend, that a belief in the *truth* will open the door to licentiousness, when facts, clear as the sun, give the *lie direct* to such asseverations. And we appeal *direct* to the conscience and heart of every father and mother, whether they would punish a child whose only motive to serve and honour them, was love for their persons, and gratitude for their favours; and reward the *wretch* for a forced compliance with their commands, whose service was extorted by the fear of punishment, and who would violate their commands whenever he could do it with impunity; and even declare, that if he believed they would not *kill him*, he would never pay any attention to them, but consult his own depraved inclinations altogether? It is no secret to the world, (however much our clergymen would like to have it one,) that a majority, and a great one too, of mankind, are deterred from wrong doing, more from fear of *present* suffering, ten times over, than from any *future* hell, even if it were reported to be *heated seven times hotter*, than any of the *pulpits* have yet *heated it!* If this should create unpleasant sensations in the mind of any reader, let this be our apology, that the conviction of our senses, strengthened by every day's observation, assimilates too much with truth, to be sacrificed to a delicate preference to error! When principles, by which mankind are actuated, are the subject for discussion, *truth* should be our only aim; and truth should have the preference to error, whether it comes vivid as the thunderbolt, bringing destruction in its train, or whether it drops like the gentle dew of heaven, diffusing blessings throughout the world. For ourselves, we believe that *error* alone is the Pandora-box, which has opened upon the world, and deluged mankind with sin and suffering. *Truth* is the only antidote to this disease, which in all its multiform and complicated appearances, is but the effect of a *single* cause. *Sin* is but another name for error; and death, the effect, is but another term for, and expresses all its consequences. Truth will ultimately destroy error. When "all shall be taught of God," then every mind will be radiant with the Divine illumination, and death, sorrow and sighing, be for ever done away.

True *repentance* being the consequence of a knowledge of our being the saved of the Lord, it follows, that any *sorrow* for sin and turning from it, for *fear* of punishment, is so far from *saving* a man, or in any way being accessary to his salvation, that it absolutely continues his sufferings. It is very true that no man can suffer the consequence of sins which he does not commit. The man, therefore, who should never sin, would find his reward in a freedom from its consequences. He would have no claim to eternal blessedness above the vilest wretch that ever existed. In this particular, they would be upon a par; for the sinner would suffer, and the man who kept the law, would "*in* keeping the law, (not *for* keeping it,) have a great reward!" Revelation, as well as reason, confirms this. "Salvation is the *gift* of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast." And the apostle again declares, of mankind, in God's estimation, "they are *all* gone out of the way. There is *no difference.* (Why?) For *all* have sinned and come short of the glory of God." And he likewise declares, of mankind, that they are "*justified freely* through *his* grace." The man, therefore, whose sorrow proceeds from *fear* of punishment, admitting his *fears* and *sorrows* are more afflicting than the natural consequences of his sins, if he continued (not in the undisturbed *enjoyment*, but *misery* of them!) sinning, is not more acceptable in the sight of God, nor so contented in himself, as the sinner who laughs at reproof, and swims willingly in every enormity. There is nothing more obvious, however, than the fact, that these fears of punishment are a consequence of the *sin*, and not a *cause* of salvation!!! Let this be remembered.

It is proper to inform Timotheus, that the Scriptures declare of Christ, that "He is exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to *give repentance* to Israel, and *remission* of sins." Not to give *sorrow!* All sinners have enough of that already! The repentance which 'Christ *gives*,' is accompanied 'with *remission of sins.*' The sinner who receives this *repentance*, knows that his sins are forgiven—he cannot *sorrow!* "for lo, the winter is past, the rain is over *and* gone. The flowers appear on the earth; the time of the *singing* is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land." The winter of unbelief, when even hope was chilled, and expectation frozen with doubts and fears, disappeared when the Sun of righteousness arose, and the peaceful breezes of salvation blew upon the soul. The rain of eyes, the weeping of uncertainty is over and gone. The flowers of the gospel appear in the believing mind—this is the time of *singing*, (not *sorrowing*) for the voice of the turtle *(dove)* which descended upon Christ our head, is heard in our land! The *sorrow* which is experienced by a believer in the Universal goodness of our heavenly Father, has *no affinity with fear!* It is that undescribable feeling which pains the grateful heart, on the reflection, that he has been remiss in his duty to a Parent, whose *love* and *tender* mercy as far transcends the love of women, as heaven is higher than the earth, or God greater than man! In the full exercise of his faith, the gift of his heavenly Father, to use the language of the poet;

"Should the whole frame of nature round him break,
In ruin and confusion hurl'd,
He, unconcern'd, would hear the mighty crack,
And *stand secure* amidst a falling world!!!"

Wishing Timotheus knowledge of, and belief in, the salvation *of God* for a fallen world, the Editor, in sincerity, subscribes himself his *Friend*.

REPREHENSOR,

(*Concluded.*)

In a Note of the Editor, (p. 157, col. 3.) he expresses an opinion that I wrote an inconsistency, in saying, the literal meaning in one part of Scripture is construed to damn millions, while in another portion it is made to save all. Is it necessary to prove this, and demonstrate how Calvinistic Baptists and Presbyterians prove the damnation of millions, while a few only are chosen and saved? and how the Calvinistic Rellyans prove that not one is damned? For one text says, "*Many* are called, but *few* are chosen;" another adds, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate, for *many* shall seek to enter, but shall not be able." Again, "There shall in no wise enter into it *any* thing that defileth, neither worketh an abomination, or maketh a lie," &c. And again, "*Wide* is the gate, and *broad* is the way that leads to destruction, and *many* there be which go in thereat," &c. Contrarily we see opposite quotations; such as, Jesus Christ "is the Saviour of *all men*;" that "he is the *head* of every man;" therefore every man is a *member* of his body and church, and so all partake of the *common salvation*, mentioned by Jude. Thus, (as the church is the "pillar and ground of truth," and is "holy," so) every member is *holy* and *true*, &c. Where now is the *inconsistency* with which the Editor charges me? Shakers have texts for dancing, the Methodists for shouting, and making a noise; the Quakers for silence and stillness; the Arians and Unitarians for one God and person; and the Athanasians and Trinitarians for three persons and one God; the Swedenborgians for one person and one God, &c. for the Jerusalemites disallow the phrase three persons in the Godhead, because unscriptural. Athanasians quote John v. 7. Whence come such things, except from the want of the Spirit of God, the only true Guide, John xvi. 13. Jer. iii. 4.

In the last paragraph of the Editor, (except the note on the signification of free-agent) he wished to excite ridicule, by pretending that he did not understand what I intended, when I compared the creation, or existence of all souls in Adam, to the creation and existence of all cod-fish in the first cod-fish which were created; for he says, "We see very little analogy between a cod-fish and the soul of man." Such a perversion of the true sense intended by the comparison, demonstrates pretty evidently how *unable* he was in any other way to get rid of the conviction of its intended signification. For I think he *knew* that it is as reasonable to suppose that *all cod-fish* were created in the first-created cod-fish, as that *all souls* were created and existed in the first-created man; so as to sin in him, and fall in him in his first transgression. For Calvinists and Rellyans believe that in Adam all *died;* of course all mankind must have existed in him, or they could not have died in him 6000 years ago or less; and if so, their souls must have been very small, and Adam's very large, to enclose or contain them. This preposterous idea, I think, may be totally removed, by explaining the text, "In Adam we all die," whenever we enter into his state of disobedience, eating of the tree of worldly knowledge of good and evil. Hence all may be said to be in Adam, whose affections are earthward, and not heavenward, or earthly-minded, and not heavenly-minded. In other expressions—To be *in* Adam's fallen, dark, evil, unnatural, and acquired or artificial state, is to be *out of* the exalted, luminous, good, natural, and primeval state, or out of Christ, the image of God in which man was created. *Proof is not wanted, to show that Adam acquired this unnatural state;* which term, by custom, has become so natural that, in the days of St. Paul, as well as now, this fallen, evil, unnatural state of man, was improperly called man's natural state. Hence I conclude, that the nature of man, before he gets into the acquired evil state, is *to do good;* but *to do evil*, when he enters by actual, (not original sin) into the acquired, evil, and unnatural state. I would have said, Proof is not wanted to show, that Adam acquired this state by his eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. It may be necessary to prove, that all who sin have also acquired this evil and unnatural state *voluntarily*, but not *necessarily*, by eating sour grapes themselves, and not by their fathers' eating them. "For as I live, saith the Lord God," by his prophet Ezekiel, "ye shall not have occasion to use this proverb in Israel, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge. Behold, all souls are mine; that soul that sinneth, it shall die:" [Not that all souls had sinned, and died pre-existently in Adam, by his eating the sour grapes of transgression.] Calvinists, Necessarians, Fatalists, and Rellyans, might, with desire and love for the truth, be benefited by perusing and pondering the whole of the 18th chapter of Ezekiel, which directly opposes the tenets of unconditional salvation, and fatality. It consequently proves the free will, or free-agency of man; his ability to commit sin; and his *power*, through the Divine gift, (which is Jesus Christ, the power, gospel, and word of God) to act obediently to the Divine will and commands. Thus he is enabled by God's assisting grace, to overcome the acquired evil state, to eat of the tree of life, and gain the crown of life promised to such victors, (Rev. ii. iii.) thus entering into their primeval, natural, pure, and living state in the paradise of God, or New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven. Rev. xxi.

The Editor says, "We have an *infallible guide* to the true understanding of the Scripture."—Readers, what do you think this infallible guide is? Papists might think it is the *council* of their church. Protestants might suppose it is their *Bible*. Each sectarian might think it is his *creed;* and the Editor has said that it is the *salvation of all men*. Now hear the Editor's answer. He says, this infallible guide is, "The declaration of Christ, who says, 'Man shall not live by *bread* alone, but by every *word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of God; and the *words* that I speak unto you, they are *spirit*, and they are *life*.' The *present* tenses are used here; and this shows, that every word that *proceedeth*, is not every word that *has proceeded*, out of the mouth of God's holy prophets and apostles, as we find them in our Bibles. Therefore, the words which *now proceed out of the mouth of God*, is the *living bread* that nourishes the soul; and this *word* is *spirit*, (God is a Spirit) and this word is life, (for God only hath life in himself;) and it is our duty to hear what the Spirit of God *now* saith, as much, if not more, than what it has said some hundred years ago to men and to the churches. John xvi. 13. Rev. ii. 11. For this word of the Holy Spirit is life, and quickens the soul, and nourishes it; and thus men are not to live by outward bread alone, but by the inward bread or word of the Holy Spirit. *Quest.* How does the soul live by every word that *proceedeth out* of the mouth of God? This is a very important question. *Ans.* The soul that disobeys, or sinneth, doth of course *die*, as in Ezek. xviii. consequently the soul *lives* by obedience to every word that *now* proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Faith *dies* without works; James ii. 17. and so does the *soul*. The Editor concludes, (though the *internal word* of God be a *part* of his Spirit of life) "that they who construe the Scriptures to the *destruction* of souls, know nothing about them;" in plain language, that they who construe the Scriptures so as not to favour the Rellyan doctrine, of *life and salvation to every man and woman*, have not the infallible guide and interpreter, and so *know nothing of the Scriptures!* All Christian professors, except Rellyans, are consequently fools: Rellyans only are *wise* in scriptural knowledge!

I will add, in my next, some other proofs in favour of free-agency, &c. *This* piece may show the weakness of the Editor's remarks upon Reprehensor; and how weakly he has bound up the broken leg of his *tripod*. But the Editor consoled himself by saying, that his stool could stand on one leg. As no stool can stand on one leg without additional support to balance it, so the Editor's stool will require more of his puissant, ingenious, and indefatigable exertions, to balance it, that it may support him, than he is aware of. I think he and his seat are in great danger of a tumble. May he fall as low into humility, as he is now high in his own ability; and I will still be his friend.

REPREHENSOR.

REMARKS.

In order that Reprehensor may in future be better enabled to understand the doctrine he is so blindly attempting to controvert, and open his eyes to his own absurdities, we call his attention to the following:—

In his fifth paragraph, he defines the word *create* to "mean, to cause *to* exist what did *not* exist." And in his seventh paragraph says, "The Editor seems to *deny* creation, unless something is made out of *nothing*." The Scriptures declare, that "God made (or formed) man out of the dust." The body of Adam existed *before* it was formed to become the residence of his soul. We believe the *soul* of man was not formed, or made, of the dust, or ground. We believe it existed *before* the body! Can Reprehensor prove to the contrary?

Reprehensor's ninth paragraph we should pass over, but for the following; "In a note of the Editor's, p. 157, col. 3. he expresses an opinion that I wrote an inconsistency in saying, "The literal meaning *in one part* of Scripture *is construed to* damn millions, *while in another portion it is made to save all.*" Reader, the words printed in *italics* are not to be found in Reprehensor's communication as he is pleased to quote them. This is a new way of accommodation. Reprehensor is happily privileged, in his own mind at least. When his *old* premises are found not to answer, he will *forge new* ones, and palm them upon the public, *if he can!!!*

Reprehensor, in his tenth paragraph, supposes that his arguments were so very irresistible, that we had recourse to "ridicule," and "pretended we did not understand," &c. It is necessary to tell him again, that *reproduction* is not *creation*. Let him apply his own definition of the word *create!* Again, Reprehensor speaks of *spirit*, as he would of *potatoes;* that when the *bushel* is full, it will hold no more. He considers the *souls* of mankind must have been inconceivably *small!* they it seems in his opinion, were *crowded* together, &c. We inform Reprehensor, that many things which are possible with God, would seem as impossible to him, and perhaps more so, than this may appear. Now, if this doctrine is agreeable to the Scriptures, he can give his assent to it

without forfeiting his reputation for wisdom, or prudence.

Reprehensor goes on to explain what he supposes is meant by "dying in Adam," &c. He says, "it is to be *out of* the exalted, luminous, good, *natural*, and PRIMEVAL state, or out of *Christ* the image of God, in which man *was* created." The reader will please to recollect, that Reprehensor discards *our* view of this subject, because it is so very *unreasonable*. His, therefore, ought, at least, to have the pre-eminency in this particular. Let us examine it. Reprehensor believes, that when a child is born, the child is *created*, &c. This of necessity must be the child's *primeval state*. This child, therefore, is then in its "exalted, luminous, good, natural, and primeval state." Now, according to him, when the child "enters into his state of disobedience, eating of the tree of *worldly knowledge* of good and evil," it is then in an "*acquired* or artificial state," and *then* it dies in Adam! Now is it not *very* reasonable to suppose, that the *infant* who closes its eyes for ever as regards this mode of existence, in *one* or *five* minutes after its birth, has "acquired this artificial worldly knowledge, entered into the state of disobedience, and eat of the tree of worldly knowledge?" &c. Reprehensor says, "Hence I conclude, that the nature of man, *before* he gets into the acquired evil state, is to do good; but to do evil, when he enters, by *actual* sin, &c. into the acquired evil and unnatural state." But man has no *nature*, because he has no existence until *born*, &c. Consequently the infant who lives in this world only *five* minutes, is *good!* He *never dies in Adam!!!* No, never! How very reasonable is all this! particularly when the Scriptures affirm, that "death has passed upon all men, for that *all have sinned!* We declare, that in our opinion, it would be an *insult* to common sense, and to the perception of the reader, to urge one word more as a confutation of this unexampled and ridiculously absurd hypothesis.

Reprehensor introduces a quotation from Ezek. xviii. Reprehensor is informed, that if he will read with as great attention as he would read the deed of a house for which he was to pay $10,000, Deut. xxviii. and afterward Ezek. xviii. and xxxvii. he will discover that his present views of that chapter are incorrect. We hope he will make the experiment; and if it fails of the desired effect, we shall be glad to hear his opinion, &c.

Reprehensor, in his eleventh paragraph, we are sorry to say, speaks disrespectfully of the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose declaration we quoted as an "infallible guide," to wit.—"Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." He says, "It is our duty to hear what the Spirit of God *now* saith, as much, *if not more*, than what *it has said* some hundred years ago to men in the churches." We have no hesitation in saying, that this is a deception of the devil!!! Can Reprehensor produce any declaration from one of God's prophets or apostles, which will sanction this? Did one of them *ever* advice or countenance a man to give heed to his *own* heart, pretending *it* was the *Spirit* of God, *more*, or even *so much*, as to God's prophets and apostles, who were inspired by him, and gave evidence of their Divine authority by the *miracles* they wrought? No, *he cannot!* This, although shaped a little different, is no better than INFIDELITY. And it is evident that the circumscribed measure of authority which is allowed to the prophets and apostles by Reprehensor, is only to *heighten his own by the contrast*. He claims a pre-eminence over *them all!* Let him produce his credentials! God's true prophets and apostles were not backward in producing *theirs*. Let him, as an earnest of the future, clear up, and reconcile to the satisfaction of any man of common sense, who is free from the trammels of Pharisaic hypocrisy, the absurd inconsistencies of his present communication! Mark well the sophistry of his subterfuge; in the attempt to do away the force and extensive sense of the declaration of Christ, which we quoted as an "infallible guide." He says, "The *present tenses* are used here; and this shows, that *every* word that proceedeth, is *not* every word that *has* proceeded," &c. This is, indeed, a wretched attempt—a miserable subterfuge! Because Christ did not make use of the *past*, *present*, and to *come*, and say, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which *ever did*, does *now*, or shall in *future* proceed from the mouth of God," he only meant that *present, passing moment!* The Scriptures declare of God, that "He is of *one mind*, and none can turn him." Does Reprehensor suppose that the Infinite Jehovah is altogether such an one as himself? That he will speak one thing *now*, and alter his mind, *and contradict himself* the next moment? We enter our solemn protest against such infamous, unreasonable, and unscriptural principles! And we shall trespass no longer on the patience of the reader, in remarking upon this absurd production, than to advise Reprehensor, instead of attempting to introduce other testimony or proofs, (if such they can be called) in support of his sentiments, to abandon, unless he can substantiate by better evidence than has yet appeared, those *already* produced, and the preposterous hypothesis they are adduced to support.

ANSWER TO GIDEON.

GIDEON (see No. 48.) proposed the following—"The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence"—"*Strive* to enter in at the strait gate"—"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy *might*"—"Work out your own salvation"—"Take up thy cross, and follow me"—"If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out." These passages, he considers, "plainly indicate *conditions* in *our* salvation." True, and we *confess* it! What! Confess salvation to be conditional? Yes; the salvation *here* spoken of! Paul says, "God is the Saviour of *all* men; especially of those that *believe*." And he explains this, when he says, "Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of *God*, by faith of Jesus Christ, *unto* all, and *upon* all *them* that *believe*, for there is no difference; for *all* have sinned," &c. But Gideon says, "On these conditions the crown of life is expressly promised," &c. We ask, What life? It may be the life that *now* is; but Paul teaches a doctrine that will not admit the bare supposition, that the crown of God's righteousness, which is *unto all*, is promised on these conditions! We believe, that if a man runs his head into a fire, it will be burnt. If he jumps into the river, he will be wet. That "tribulation and anguish will be upon every soul of man that doeth evil." We likewise believe, that he who "by patient continuance in well doing, seeketh for glory and immortality," will experience the joys arising from the assurance of *eternal life*. But we believe, that to obtain this, he must seek, not his *own* glory, but the glory of *God*, and that life which is in his Son.

We believe in *two* salvations. First, in the salvation of God for a lost world—all men. Second, in a salvation which is a consequence of a knowledge of, and belief in, the truth. The first is explained by the apostle, when he says, the "righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ, is *unto* all"—the second, when he says, it is "*upon* all them that *believe*." And his declaration, that "there is no difference," and the reason why there is no difference, that "*all have sinned*, and come short of the glory of God, proves, that salvation is the *gift* of God, without regard to our merits or demerits; and if any other evidence were wanting to prove this, the following proves it beyond the possibility of refutation—"Being (in the past tense) *justified freely* (not conditionally) by his *grace*, (not our works) through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." God is "the fountain of living waters." Those who go to him do not thirst. But the Arminian will never drink his fill, so long as he depends upon a "broken cistern which can hold *no* water." We therefore say, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate"—"Work out *your own* salvation"—and "pluck out" your Arminian eye which offends, and have an eye single to the glory of God, and the happiness of man.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

In looking over the Communications passing between *Philotheus* and the Editor, particularly in regard to the salvation of man being unconditional, and the Scriptures being the word of God, I would, as to the latter, advise Philotheus to grant the Editor's position; admit the Scriptures to be the word of God, in a sense as unlimited as the Scriptures themselves can give; and to obviate a disagreement, which naturally arises as to the meaning of their evidence, it will be granted on all hands, that it is testimony, and claimed to prove different, nay, opposite things. Let the Scriptures be appealed to for the certainty and identity of their meaning, from Genesis to the Revelation; and their evidence be considered accordingly. Without establishing some limitation to the meaning of evidence, you may contend for ages without settling the point in question.

First, settle what the Scriptures *are* in themselves.

Next, what they *can* prove, and what they *cannot*.

If you cannot settle these points, you will labour to little profit, and prove any thing your caprice or prejudice may direct.

I should be glad to hear again from Theophilus, Doddridge, and Dean. If admissible with the Editor's views, it would be gratifying to see the publication addressed to J. C. and Impartialist.

SAVIN.

SAVIN can be gratified by J. C. and Impartialist; if they please to publish it, we shall have no objections to delivering them the manuscript. ED.

A DIALOGUE

Between Miss G. a young lady of gentle manners and a spotless character, of the Society of the Universalists, and the Rev. Mr. S. and the Rev. Mr. A. two clergymen of the Calvinistic faith.

The following dialogue is given, as an instance of the *manner* in which the friends of *awakenings* make their attacks upon the inexperienced and susceptible, and the *spirit* in which they treat the faith of Christians of other denominations.

It should be remarked that the young lady went, on the 23d of February, 1821, to the house of Mr. F. in this City, (Hudson) to call on her young friend Miss F. When she went in she found Mrs. F. and the two clergymen in the room. Mrs. F. went out to inform her daughter that Miss G. had called to see her, and then Mr. S. with a graceful and well-bred reach of the neck, stooping so as to look under her bonnet, thus accosted Miss. G.

Mr. S.—Where do you live?

Miss G.—In South-street.

Mr. S.—What is your name?

Miss G.—(Thinking the question rather impertinent, replied) Sir!

Mr. S.—(Apparently thinking so too, observed) I think I have seen you before, but I do not recollect your name.

Miss G.—My name is G.

Mr. S.—Daughter of G. G?

Miss G.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. S.—Do you see how well employed your young friends are, in the pursuit of Christ; and do you not think they appear happy?

Miss G.—I think, Sir, they appear far from being *happy*.

Mr. S.—Do you ever think of the salvation of your soul?

Miss G.—Often, Sir.

Mr. S.—Do you think you will be saved?

Miss G.—I do, Sir

Mr. S.—Then you think you have not sinned?

Miss G.—You are mistaken, Sir; I think *all* have sinned; I commit sins daily.

Mr. S.—And do you think you will not be punished for those sins?

Miss G.—I think I *shall* be punished for them, but not *eternally*.

Mr. S.—Do you not know that you will go to *Hell*, and be *eternally* punished?

Miss G.—(The embarrassment which she felt at being thus rudely treated, gradually giving way to a just indig-

nation, this replied) I do not, Sir; for I have never committed sins that will *deserve eternal* punishment.

Mr. A.—Do you (to Miss G.) know the commandments? do you know the *first* commandment?

Mr. S.—*No:* (interrupting with strong emphasis) she does *not* know them; she does not know the first commandment.

Miss G.—(Answering for herself) I *do*, Sir; and I *love* my *God;* and believe that God is all love.

Mr. S.—Yes, and a God all *just*, is he not?

Miss G.—Certainly, Sir.

Mr. S.—And *you don't love* God.

Miss G.—I *do*, Sir; and should be *miserable* if I did *not*.

Mr. S.—And *why* do you love him?

Miss G.—Because he bestows his *blessings* upon me daily.

Mr. S.—Are you happy?

Miss G.—I *am*, Sir; for I have nothing to make me unhappy.

Mr. S.—You are a poor child, and *led astray;* and do you know this passage—"He that believeth and is baptized, shall be *saved;* but he that believeth not, shall be *damned?*" You don't know the Lord.

Miss G.—*If* I do *not*, "all *shall* know the Lord, from the *least* unto the *greatest*"—and, "I will forgive their sins, and their iniquities will I *remember* no more."

Mr. S.—The sins of *his people* he will remember no more.

Miss G.—I thought *all* were *his* people.

Mr. A.—(Taking Miss G. by the arm as she was going) Did you ever *pray?*

Miss G.—I *often* pray, Sir.

Mr. S.—It is *useless* to talk to her; she will go to *hell*, for she is *stubborn* and *wilful*. (Mrs. F. now present.)

Mr. A.—No, Mr. S., we do not *wish* her to go to hell; we wish her to go to heaven. Will you (to Miss G.) *pray now?* Will you pray God that your sins may be forgiven?

Miss G.—(Alluding to the previous declaration of Mr. S. that she would go to hell; that it was useless to talk to her, replied) I thought God was unchangeable.

Mr. A.—Will you pray when you go home?

Miss G.—I *often* pray, Sir.

Mr. A.—That is not the question; *will* you *pray* when you go *home?*

Miss G.—Yes.

Mr. A.—That is all I want.

Finding Miss G. too well settled in her principles, too intelligent to be entrapped, and too firm to be frightened, by these *truly amiable* messengers of that gospel, which teacheth that "love is the fulfilling of the law," and pretenders to that charity, "which suffereth long, and is kind; which vaunteth not itself, and is not puffed up," desisted from further outrage; and Miss G. went home.

ISAIAH xli. 28, 29.

"For I beheld, and there was *no man;* even among *them*, and there was *no counsellor*, that when *I asked* of them, *could answer a word.* Behold, *they* are all *vanity; their* works are *nothing!*"

One year has passed, since the publication of this Paper commenced. The *first* Number was sent to all the clergymen in this city, whose places of residence could be found; and occasionally since that time, they, especially those of the Calvinistic persuasion, have been *favoured* with it! The reverend disciples of Calvin, *to a man*, have kept in the *back ground*. Concern for their *salaries*, (which is now *de facto* become a convertible term for *souls*) has, we think, been a party in this ceremonious silence! The consideration that these gentlemen are "seized with a noble phrensy," and consider the "*honour of God*, and the salvation of millions of *souls* at stake," may, by some, be urged as an apology. We think, however, that facts will not justify an excuse of that complexion. It is well known, that this Calvinistic phalanx, a few years since, attempted, in their *phrensy* to establish, and continue, a publication in this city, which having suddenly stopped, and their *phrensy* remaining, it must be conceded, we think, that their *phrensy* was unequal to the task of supporting it. Their attempt established a precedent. They failed in what they, no doubt, considered a laudable undertaking. Now, here is a paper established to their hands, free of expense, (which to them, we think, is not altogether a matter of absolute *indifference,*) the columns open for any communications they might have been pleased to have inserted, (for the good of souls) and not one of them, although they are *all* "seized with a *noble phrensy*," "When *I asked* of them, *could answer a word!* Behold, *they are all vanity! their works are nothing!!!*"

Turning from this disgusting picture of human depravity, and Pharisaic hypocrisy, the Editor, with sensations of unspeakable gratitude and thanksgiving to our beneficent heavenly Father, for his Divine assistance and protection, would direct the attention of the friends of *truth* to the triumphant victory which, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, our Divine Head and Redeemer, has been achieved over error, in all its Protean forms, and delusive attacks and appearances! The *truth*, like "gold tried seven times and purified," shines with refulgent glory and undiminished lustre. Error, that hydra of a hundred heads, is either hiding his deformed visage, or suffering decapitation on appearing—the fate denounced by indignant heaven.

An auspicious era is dawning upon this western world. Here, where the warwhoop of the untutored savage gave place to Calvin's persecuting sword, has succeeded the peaceful illumination of the Sun of Righteousness, the Redeemer of the world! Here, where Despair sat for her picture—where Uncertainty portrayed, with the pencil of Contradiction, futurity in gloomy horrors—is displayed, beneath the bright insignia of a peaceful Heaven, a *Universal Saviour*, and God of Love. Here, where *Error* presided in sable majesty, chaining the mind to Superstition's bloody car, *Truth*, vivid as the lightning of heaven, or coruscations of ethereal fire—heralded by Demonstration, has severed the fetters of the captives, and set the prisoners free! To the silence of doubt, the agony of suspense, and the gloom of uncertainty, has succeeded the voice of thanksgiving, the triumph of confidence unbounded, and the persuasions of a faith founded upon the promises of Jehovah, and the *oath* of God. Cheered with these bright visions of substantial reality, the mind soars on wings of triumph in quest of venture, to Europe's heaven-emancipated shores. There, the last echoes of the groans of tortured victims, immolated at fanaticism's accursed shrine, dies upon the ear; while songs of victory bespeak the commencement of the peaceful reign of Jesus, God's anointed King! The black catalogue, which licensed oppression filled with letters of blood, and records of murderous deeds, written with hands stained with crimes of hellish hue, has been unrolled to an astonished world; and the light of heaven has exorcised dungeons, which have rivalled in competition superstition's hell!

Here faith pauses—humanity shudders—but, for a moment. He who maketh darkness his pavilion, and rides upon the wings of the wind, will wield the besom of destruction until creation is purged of moral corruption, disease, and death; and space and heaven know no *bounds* but *happiness*, and man no *place* but *heaven!*

From the London Universalist's Miscellany.

THE REQUEST OF A. B. C. TO THE TRINITARIANS, DUALIANS, AND UNITARIANS.

The Trinitarian table, or rule of Three, taken from the Athanasian Creed, is as follows:

You are neither to confound the figures, nor divide the substance.

The first figure is 1—the second figure is 1—and the third figure is 1.

And yet you are compelled, by this rule, to acknowledge that every one of these ones, is one by itself.

And yet you are forbidden, by the same rule, to say there are three ones:—for there are not three, but one.

Now, my request to the Trinitarians is, that they would work, and prove the following sums by this rule, in so complete and easy a manner, as to make the rule plain and useful to me:

If 1 make 3, how many must 12 make?

If 3 make only 1, how many must 72 make?

The Dualian table is, that the Father and the Holy Ghost are one; the Holy Ghost being no other than the power, the influence, and operation of God. That Jesus Christ was the very first existence produced by the Father;—that all things were made by him, and that he is called God in the Scriptures.

My request to these is, that they would prove the propriety of the Scriptures in speaking of the Holy Ghost as a person;—and, as they say Jesus is not the same in person with the Father—that they would also prove, that they do not make two Gods.

The Unitarian table is, that Jesus Christ had no existence before he was conceived of the virgin, and that he was only a mere man, in whom God dwelt in a wonderful manner. Now, my request to them is, that they will prove, in a plain and easy way, without putting any force upon the texts, that the following passages are not to be understood in their outward, plain, and literal sense. John i. 1, 2, 3, and 10.—iii. 13.—xvi. 28.—xviii. 5.—2 Cor. viii. 9.—Eph. iii. 9.—Col. i. 15, 16.—Heb. i. 2.—Rev. i. 11.—iii. 14.

A. B. C. is neither a Trinitarian, Dualian, nor Unitarian, but is waiting for conviction; and therefore if any of these descriptions will answer his request in a candid, plain, and concise manner, and get their performance inserted in any of the most public Magazines; or, if published by itself, get it inserted in the list of new publications, in any of the Reviews, they will very much oblige their humble servant, A. B. C.

RELIGION,

In stature, is supremely tall—her limbs and features in the most perfect symmetry—her air serenely awful, and her countenance comely—bearing the express image of youth and vigour, and tinged with an unfading bloom.

She is the eldest daughter of an eternal Father—bearing in her person the most striking resemblance of all his attributes.

She is clothed in white—the original raiment in which her Father clothed her, and which is remarkable for two peculiar properties—endless duration, and an utter incapacity of receiving the least tarnish.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

It is confidently expected, that Subscribers in distant towns, who have not yet paid their subscriptions, will avail themselves of the earliest opportunity to forward their arrearages to the Editor. It is presumed that very few, if any, have patronized this paper, except those, who, if they are not believers in the "restitution of all things," are very solicitous to see the downfal of superstitious bigotry, and ecclesiastical tyranny, and to see a free investigation of truth and religious liberty in their stead. It will therefore occur to their minds, that, of all who have taken art or part in this publication, the *Editor*, in consequence of the disproportion which exists between the trouble of conducting the work and the remuneration, in a pecuniary point of view, admitting every cent subscribed is promptly paid, has, by far, the most laborious and unprofitable part.

It is likewise expected, that our city Subscribers, who are yet in arrearages, will not admit any unnecessary delay in their payment.

*** City Subscribers, and those in adjacent towns, are informed, that by sending their papers to the residence of the Editor, No. 53 Elm-street, (as soon as may be,) they can have them bound in *calf-skin* backs and corners for 37 1-2 cents per volume, which is *half* price for *sheep*. A book-binder has offered to do them for this very low sum, and the Editor will, with pleasure, take the trouble of receiving them, conveying them to the bindery, and when ready for delivery, give notice, &c. Subscribers are requested to write their names on the envelope enclosing their papers, &c.

Note.—Distant subscribers are informed, that the contemplated alteration in the form of the Gospel Herald, will *not* increase the postage.

ERRATA.

In the Index, first column, letter D—"*Doddridge, Dr. his opinion of what constitutes*" its connexion, "the incredible," &c. is transposed *two* lines below. Third column, under P. "*Preaching* Welch, Specimen," &c. read *Remarks on, by Mentor, page* 138.

N. B. Correspondents will find the Letter-Box at the left side of the door on entering the Printing-Office.

EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.
HOYT & BOLMORE, PRINTERS, 70 BOWERY.